

this company's relationship with I. G. Farben over a 13-year period had stifled synthetic rubber production in America and had put control over that vital defense product in the hands of the German Government. In addition, Thurman Arnold, then Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division, testified that as late as February and March 1941, Jersey Standard had sold gasoline and enabled Axis airlines operating out of South America to defeat the British blockade. Indignation over these disclosures caused the then Senator Harry S. Truman to remark "I think this approaches treason."<sup>1</sup>

An aroused public after these hearings required Jersey Standard to relieve the principal officer involved from his duties in the company.

Another example of oil industry officials' failure to act responsibly is found in the remarks of Mr. P. C. Spencer, president of the Sinclair Oil Corp., at a meeting of the National Petroleum Council on September 29, 1953. On that occasion Arthur S. Flemming, Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, had requested the Secretary of Interior, Douglas McKay, to explore with the oil industry construction of standby pipeline facilities that would be required in the event of an emergency. In his request, Mr. Flemming noted " \* \* \* it is apparent that timely provisions of this additional capacity could not be achieved, if construction were to be deferred until after the emergency arose."<sup>2</sup>

Mr. Flemming's request was presented to the National Petroleum Council, whereupon Mr. Spencer opposed the construction of standby pipeline facilities. He stated:

"Surpluses not properly handled or controlled are an anathema, because they have a way of destroying price structures, they have a way of breaking down progress, and they can destroy an industry. It certainly

would be a tragedy, gentlemen, to attempt to protect our national security by building up standby facilities which in the end make the industry so feeble it could not do the job in any event.

"I am talking particularly here about standby pipeline facilities. It applies with equal force to standby tanker facilities, standby refining facilities, standby storage, and, if you please, standby production. It applies all through the line."<sup>3</sup>

As to his solution for the maintenance of a proper mobilization base, Mr. Spencer said:

"I am a rank amateur as a strategist in war or logistics, but it seems to me, perhaps somebody told me, that the greatest cushion in the world for petroleum reserves is in the elasticity of and the flexibility of civilian demand. Take it away from them, if we are going to have a war. \* \* \* We have tried to make war too comfortable and too convenient for civilians. \* \* \* War should be tough. We should cut back the civilian demand. I think that is the greatest reserve cushion we have."<sup>4</sup>

It is submitted that these statements hardly reflect the requisite degree of corporate responsibility for the problems of the American public.

Currently, the Senate is again investigating the petroleum industry in connection with the actions the industry has taken to resolve the crisis presented by closure of the Suez Canal. In this instance, it appears that the oil industry has again acted with a view toward corporate profits rather than the welfare of the American public. At a time when stocks of gasoline were at alltime highs, the industry used the Suez crisis as an excuse to impose additional price increases. As of February 8, 1957, the industry had nearly 200 million barrels of gasoline in stocks. This was an increase of nearly 4 million barrels over the preceding week and 12 million barrels over the stocks in storage a year ago. It now develops that the crisis presented by the Suez shutdown was not as extensive as originally feared. In fact, there is a widespread belief that the public relations cam-

paign surrounding the seriousness of the crisis were based in large part upon recommendations made by the major oil companies in order to justify an increase in crude petroleum prices.

In conclusion, I think you will all agree that the problems presented by the existing concentration in American industry are most intricate.

Let no one doubt that benefits from our existing corporate structure are substantial. I believe it is fair to say that the United States as a community has profited mightily in the development of our current corporate economic structure. The system of large scale distribution and mass production made possible by these large institutions can fairly claim the credit for changing the face of our country for the better. As a result, poverty, in the sense it is understood elsewhere in the world, in America has been reduced to minimal proportions.

The most dramatic social revolution in history has occurred through natural growth and without the bitter divisions that have darkened the political life of other nations. It gave the lie to Karl Marx.

All to the good, but the good must not be diminished. Unless the powers that have been concentrated in corporate management are exercised prudently and with vision, it is apparent that this concentration will force the Government to take action and direct the complex itself, and freedom will be the price we pay.

I am convinced that it is essential to maintain in full vigor enforcement of the anti-trust laws to cope with these problems even though in some respects results have not been satisfactory. Change must be made slowly. The problem presented by existing concentrates are of such gravity that precipitous action by the Government on any particular phase would be unwise. Tinkering with the economic process without full comprehension of the results likely to ensue, could create more problems than are solved.

We must hope the determination of the type of economic life of and the nature of political institutions which are to be enjoyed by the American people in the future, rests in the hands of those who understand freedom best.

<sup>1</sup> Hearings, Current Antitrust Problems, vol. 2, House Antitrust Subcommittee, 84th Cong., 1st sess., p. 755.

<sup>2</sup> Hearings, WOC's and Advisory Groups, pt. 4, House Antitrust Subcommittee, 84th Cong., 2d sess., p. 2636.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid., p. 2640.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid., p. 2640.

## SENATE

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 1957

Rev. R. L. Clem, rector of St. John's Military School, Salina, Kans., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, Thou who hast so richly blessed this Nation, we thank Thee for the heritage that is ours. Grant that Thy people everywhere may have the grace to understand what is Thy will, and the strength and determination to fulfill Thy purpose for us. Lift us, we beseech Thee, above all selfishness. Keep our hearts in confident trust. Make us reverent in the use of our freedom, and deepen within us our faith and righteousness.

We invoke Thy blessing upon this body here assembled, that they may rise to high levels of devotion and service to the benefit of all people and to Thy honor and glory. This we pray in Christ's name. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Journal

of the proceedings of Monday, February 25, 1957, was approved, and its reading was dispensed with.

### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

### EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session, The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Olin Hatfield Chilson, of Colorado, to be Under Secretary of the Interior, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

### CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum. The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gore	Morton
Allott	Green	Mundt
Anderson	Hayden	Murray
Barrett	Hennings	Neely
Beall	Hickenlooper	Neuberger
Bennett	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bible	Holland	Pastore
Blakley	Hruska	Payne
Bricker	Humphrey	Potter
Bush	Ives	Purtell
Butler	Jackson	Revercomb
Byrd	Javits	Robertson
Capehart	Jenner	Russell
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Carroll	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Case, N. J.	Kefauver	Scott
Case, S. Dak.	Kennedy	Smathers
Chavez	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Church	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Clark	Kuchel	Sparkman
Cooper	Lausche	Stennis
Cotton	Long	Symington
Dirksen	Magnuson	Talmadge
Douglas	Malone	Thurmond
Dworshak	Mansfield	Thye
Eastland	Martin, Iowa	Watkins
Ellender	McCarthy	Wiley
Ervin	McClellan	Williams
Flanders	McNamara	Young
Frear	Monroney	
Goldwater	Morse	

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is absent on official business.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

PROPOSED UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT TO  
LIMIT DEBATE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have asked for a quorum call in order that all Senators might be on notice with respect to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement which I suggested yesterday, and which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on page 2495.

I ask that the clerk read the agreement, and I now propose it, on behalf of the distinguished minority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND] and myself.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the clerk will read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

*Ordered*, That, effective on Thursday, February 28, 1957, at the conclusion of routine morning business, during the further consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 19) to authorize the President to undertake economic and military cooperation with nations in the general area of the Middle East in order to assist in the strengthening and defense of their independence, debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 60 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority leader: *Provided*, That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further*, That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said joint resolution shall be received.

*Ordered further*, That if and when the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, whether or not amended, is agreed to, the Committees on Foreign Relations and Armed Services jointly shall be deemed to be discharged from the further consideration of House Joint Resolution 117, the companion House measure; that said joint resolution shall be deemed to be amended by striking out all after the resolving clause and in lieu thereof inserting the text of Senate Joint Resolution 19 as amended; and that the amendment to the said House joint resolution shall be deemed to have been engrossed and the joint resolution shall then be read the third time.

*Ordered further*, That on the question of the final passage of the said joint resolution debate shall be limited to 8 hours, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided*, That the said leaders or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the joint resolution, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Texas?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, there are three things which I should like to point out for the information of the Senate.

First, if this agreement should be entered into, it would not become effective until Thursday.

Second, 1 hour is provided for each amendment, 30 minutes to a side.

Third, a total of 8 hours is provided on the joint resolution. Any of that time can be yielded on amendments if Senators so desire.

I hope every Member of the Senate will give this proposal serious consideration. I am not claiming it is perfect. It is open to adjustments if Senators feel that it is necessary to increase the time or reduce the time. I hope we may be able to remain in session a little later, work a little longer, and conduct our business a little more efficiently, so that perhaps we may reach a vote this week.

If we do not get a unanimous consent agreement, and if we are unable to reach a vote through the normal processes, it may be necessary to have a Saturday session. I do not like to ask Senators to attend a session of the Senate on Saturday, when they have so much work in their offices and so many other duties to attend to; but this is an important matter. It has been before the Senate for a substantial length of time. Senators have been accorded great opportunity to express themselves.

The Senate will remain in session as late as Senators may desire this evening, tomorrow evening, and the remainder of the week.

I appeal to my colleagues seriously to consider the suggestions which the leaders have made. If they feel that they cannot go along with us at this time, I hope they will make some constructive alternative suggestions.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Texas?

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I have listened very carefully to the debate during the past week. It seems to me that the debate has been very spirited. Many Senators are beginning to come out from behind the brush.

I was very much interested in listening to the speech yesterday by the able junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE].

I believe that further debate is necessary. I myself have awaited my turn. As I recall, I told the majority leader that I would like to speak on Thursday. It is not important when. However, I think it is unwise to limit debate at this time, when it seems to me we are just beginning to get some of the answers. I object.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Texas is always eager to accommodate his friend from Nevada. I wonder whether he would be willing to withhold his objection for the time being so that perhaps we may reach some modifications in the proposed unanimous-consent agreement which would suit his convenience and in that way permit us to obtain an agreement; or does the Senator feel that we should not enter into any agreement at this time?

Mr. MALONE. I think it is a very laudable ambition of the distinguished

majority leader, who has always shown himself cooperative with all Members of the Senate, on both sides of the aisle on every subject; however, at this time I would have to object.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE  
BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour for the transaction of the usual routine business. I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, may I have the question stated?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield, Mr. President, and I ask unanimous consent that the time I yield to the Senator from Oregon not be charged to my 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROPOSED UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I assume the Senator from Oregon wishes to speak on the proposed unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. MORSE. I will accommodate myself to even less than 3 minutes. However, I believe, in view of the fact that the majority leader, on behalf of himself and the minority leader, has raised a procedural matter in connection with the unanimous-consent agreement, it may be well that I speak on that subject now. I may say that other Senators also hold the point of view expressed by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE].

I think it might be well to get it out of our system at this time, and therefore, I should like to make some observations on the procedural point raised by the majority leader, if I may be permitted to do so.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have no desire to foreclose any discussion of the subject. I have some statements I should like to make under the 3-minute rule. I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that I may yield to the Senator for not to exceed 3 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. I will not take 3 minutes.

I am glad the Senator from Nevada objected, because I would have been one of the other Senators who would have objected if he had not done so. The Senator from Nevada and I are not alone in taking this position. There are a considerable number of us who feel that debate on this subject should not be limited. However, I wish to address myself to the whole matter of unanimous-consent agreements to limit debate in the Senate.

I have been making a study of the subject. I wish to say most respectfully that I believe we are moving too far away from the regular order of business in the Senate. I believe we have gone too



far already, as a matter of general practice, in not transacting business in the Senate without unanimous-consent agreements limiting debate and fixing time for voting. I believe it is a very bad procedural practice, and it ought to be brought to an end, not only with respect to the pending joint resolution, but with respect to all other items of business; and I intend to do that in this session of Congress. That should be the procedure followed, except when it is absolutely necessary to limit debate.

I believe that the place for Senators to be is in the Senate Chamber listening to debate. Each one of us knows what happens when we accept a unanimous-consent agreement to limit debate and to vote at a fixed time. Senators go about their business, instead of attending to the business on the floor of the Senate. I do not think that is in keeping with the functions of this body. The whole practice of transacting business, by and large, primarily by way of unanimous-consent agreements is bad practice, and I am not going to support it in this session of Congress. I am particularly not going to support it with respect to the pending joint resolution. I think much debate still needs to be had on it. All one need do is to watch one's mail to find out what is happening to American public opinion as more and more people comprehend what is involved in this very dangerous resolution proposed by the Eisenhower administration, so far as the Middle East foreign policy is concerned.

I happen to believe that no resolution on the Middle East policy ought to be adopted until some of the pending disputes in the Middle East, which threaten peace in the Middle East, are resolved.

Furthermore, as the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] pointed out yesterday, we ought to know what the economic program of this administration is with respect to specific projects that are going to be supported by the money for which the President is asking. We should have full debate on the whole question.

The regular rules of the Senate take care of the situation. If no Senator is prepared to discuss the pending question, or wants to discuss it, the discussion is stopped, and the Senate votes. What is wrong with that?

So far as the majority leader's suggestion is concerned that we sit longer hours, I can only say that in this delightful brotherhood we enjoy each other's company. I do not mind spending evenings with my colleagues, and I assume that is the fraternal spirit that moves my colleagues. Therefore I have no objection to spending evenings and even Saturdays in the Senate. That suggestion does not disturb me.

What disturbs me, Mr. President, is that we are creating a pattern by which the business of the Senate is coming to be transacted almost entirely or certainly in many instances by unanimous-consent agreements limiting debate. I do not believe that is in keeping with the true parliamentary functions of the Senate. Therefore, as a matter of policy, Mr. President, I am against it; and in this

session of the Senate I will not give unanimous consent to limit the debate, except on very rare occasions.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I believe my colleagues are on notice that it is impossible to obtain a unanimous-consent agreement at this stage of the game, and perhaps even later, so far as the pending resolution is concerned.

I should like to point out to all my colleagues, however, that when debate ceases, the joint resolution will be open to amendment; the Chair will put the question, and, unless Senators are here to express themselves, as they were not here last week, a vote may be taken on this very important measure.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is now in order.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

##### REPORT ENTITLED "RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROCUREMENT ACTION REPORT"

A letter from the Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential report of that Department entitled "Research and Development Procurement Action Report," covering the period from July 1, 1956, to December 31, 1956 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

##### PROPOSED CONSTITUTION OF ALASKA

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior transmitting an original copy of the proposed Constitution of Alaska (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

##### AMENDMENT OF FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT OF 1938

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to restrict its application in certain overseas areas, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

Two resolutions of the Senate of the State of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Finance:

"The Social Security Act has been extended so as to provide benefits for totally disabled persons who are over the age of 50 years.

"The law as written is difficult to interpret and administer and the few persons who come within its general scope are unsuccessful in obtaining benefits.

"The humanitarianism of the law cannot be questioned and if practicable and possible, should be clarified and made less stringent so that worthy totally disabled persons over 50 years of age can obtain benefits it affords: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Senate of Pennsylvania memorialize Congress to clarify the existing provisions and further, to relax the strict requirements of the Federal social security law that relates to eligibility for benefits for totally disabled persons over the age of 50 years; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the presiding officers of both Houses of Congress and to each Senator and Member of the House of Representatives from Pennsylvania in the Congress of the United States.

"I certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution introduced by Senators W. J. Lane, James S. Berger, and John H. Dent and adopted by the Senate of Pennsylvania the 12th day of February, 1957.

"A. H. LETZLER,  
"Secretary, Senate of Pennsylvania."

"The impending cessation of operations of the Vesta Coal Mine, a subsidiary of Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp., in the borough of California, in Washington County, Pa., will rapidly increase unemployment in surrounding communities located in Washington, Greene, and Fayette Counties.

"Unemployment and consequent hardship in these three counties is of vital concern to the people of this entire Commonwealth. The economic dislocation of any large area within this Commonwealth has its repercussions throughout the entire State, and affects the economic well-being of the entire State as well as arousing the humanitarian instincts and sympathetic concern for fellow Pennsylvanians in their hour of need and duress. Economic need and want vitally effects not only adults, but many helpless children who will feel the want of proper food, clothing, housing, and medical facilities, and should the economic dislocation continue for a long period of time, the want of proper educational facilities through lack of teachers and buildings.

"Government should be concerned with helping areas with serious economic difficulties through aiding business and any type of productive economic enterprise to locate in the suffering areas.

"Washington, Greene, and Fayette Counties have a large, skillful, and willing labor force which has proven its desire in the past to produce the essential products of our modern economy. The tax structures in these three counties are favorable to business, and many industrial sites are available to manufacturing enterprises and other business activities which care to locate in communities where the public and its leadership will lend the utmost cooperation in establishing an atmosphere favorable to the establishment and growth of business: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Senate of Pennsylvania memorialize the Congress of the United States to make a thorough study of the possibility of locating Government subsidized industries in Washington, Greene, and Fayette Counties, and to take into consideration the huge labor pools available, as well as the large number of available industrial sites and favorable tax structures existing in these three counties; and be it further

"Resolved That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the presiding officers of each House of the Congress of the United States and to each Senator and Representative from Pennsylvania in the Congress of the United States.

"I certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution introduced by Senators W. J. Lane, Thomas J. Kalman, Rowland B. Mahany, Frank Kopriver, Jr., Joseph M. Barr, and John H. Dent, and adopted by the Senate of Pennsylvania the 18th day of February 1957.

"A. H. LETZLER,  
"Secretary, Senate of Pennsylvania."

A letter in the nature of a petition from the junior class of the Morganza, La., High School, relating to portions of Washington's Farewell Address; ordered to lie on the table.

# RESOLUTION OF TEXAS STATE SENATE

Mr. BLAKLEY. Mr. President, on behalf of my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Texas and majority leader [Mr. JOHNSON], and myself, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred, a resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Texas.

This resolution urges the President of the United States to take immediate steps to limit the importation of foreign oil to the 1954 percentage of the domestic market, as recommended by the President's own advisory committee.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

## Senate Resolution 126

Whereas the President of the United States has called upon oil producers and proration boards to consider where our long-term interests are with reference to current oil production, thereby implying some failure on the part of such producers or State regulatory boards to consider the public interest in their actions; and

Whereas the Railroad Commission of Texas is required by the laws of this State to promote sound conservation practices and prevent waste of irreplaceable natural resources; and

Whereas the inability of Texas to produce and transport more oil without waste has resulted from the continued and constantly increasing excessive importing of foreign oil into this country; and

Whereas the oil lift to Europe can succeed if members of the Middle East Emergency Committee, made up of international companies given Federal antitrust immunity, were required to (1) divert their excessive imports to Europe, (2) reduce refinery runs to free crude oil for export, or (3) change their refinery yields to produce needed fuel oils; and

Whereas the National Congress has authorized the President and the executive department by the Trade Agreements Act of 1955 to limit foreign oil to its 1954 percentage of the domestic market; and

Whereas the executive department has failed to take any positive action to secure such limitation, allowing such imports to rise from 16.6 percent in 1954 to over 20 percent at the present time, thus curtailing the ability of Texas producers to produce and market, finance new discoveries, or transport new domestic supplies of oil from the interior to the seaboard; and

Whereas over 1 million barrels per day of potential Texas production cannot be transported to the gulf coast due to lack of transportation resulting from excessive importing, not only limiting the amount of oil available for Europe but endangering the future national security: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate of the State of Texas, That the President of the United States be urged to take immediate steps to limit imports of foreign oil to their 1954 percentage of the domestic market as authorized by the Congress and required for the security of the United States; and be it further*

*Resolved, That the secretary of the senate is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States and to each Member of Congress from Texas.*

BEN RAMSEY,  
President of the Senate.

I hereby certify that the above resolution was adopted by the senate on February 13, 1957.

CHARLES SCHNABEL,  
Secretary of the Senate.

# INCREASE IN OIL PRICES— RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present a resolution from the Shevlin Copley Farmers Union Local, of Bagley, Minn., opposing recent increases in oil prices.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution may be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 20, 1957.

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,  
Washington, D. C.:

Whereas there is an investigation being conducted in regard to the raise in the price of gas and fuel oil to consumers in the United States; and

Whereas we can see no reason for a raise in price just because oil is being exported in huge quantities, and as we farmers are taking less and less for what we have to market; and

Whereas the big oil companies apparently influence to a great extent the doings of the Congress of the United States: Therefore be it

*Resolved, That we, the members of the Shevlin Copley Farmers Union Local No. 341, go on record as opposed to the recent raise in price and any further raise under present conditions in the price of gasoline and fuel oil or like commodities.*

Mrs. OSCAR KVAND, Secretary.

# BROADER COVERAGE OF UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION—PETITION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have just received a letter from Local 337 of the United Garment Workers of America, of New Ulm, Minn., embodying a petition concerning broader coverage of unemployment compensation.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter may be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED GARMENT WORKERS OF AMERICA,  
LOCAL NO. 337,  
New Ulm, Minn., February 18, 1957.

Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY,  
State Capitol Building,  
St. Paul, Minn.

DEAR SENATOR: We, of Local 337, Garment Workers of America, are for increased benefits in unemployment compensation. We believe there should be broadened coverage. We favor the elimination of unfair disqualifications.

Gratefully yours,

LEONA AUSTAD,  
Recording Secretary.

# EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,  
The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

C. Douglas Dillon, of New Jersey, to be a Deputy Under Secretary of State, vice Herbert V. Prochnow;

G. Frederick Reinhardt, of California, to be Counselor of the Department of State, vice Douglas MacArthur 2d; and

Walter K. Schwinn, of Connecticut, and sundry other persons, for appointment and promotion in the Foreign Service.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Hyde Gillette, of Illinois; to be an Assistant Postmaster General, vice Albert J. Robertson;

John M. McKibbin, of Pennsylvania, to be an Assistant Postmaster General, vice Norman R. Abrams; and

Sixty-two postmasters.

# BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 1370. A bill for the relief of Wanda Wawrzyczek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PURTELL:

S. 1371. A bill for the relief of Carmelo Vinci; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1372. A bill to waive any claims of the United States for the repayment of loans made by the Department of State to Harry H. Thomas and Jeanne A. Thomas; and

S. 1373. A bill for the relief of Noel Kaiser; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 1374. A bill for the relief of Marie Frittmann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHOEPEL (by request):

S. 1375. A bill for the relief of Sheldon J. Coffman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 1376. A bill for the relief of Chong You How (also known as Edward Charles Yee), his wife, Eng Lai Fong, and his child, Chong Yim Keung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOPER (for himself and Mr. MORTON):

S. 1377. A bill to remove inequities created by, and to avoid discrimination resulting from, administrative practices and enforcement of the Civil Service Retirement Act of 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LONG (for himself and Mr. ELLENDER):

S. 1378. A bill to provide for modification of the existing project for Chefuncte River and Bogue Falia, La.; and

S. 1379. A bill to modify and extend the project for Lake Pontchartrain, La.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 1380. A bill to authorize the imposition of civil penalties for violation of the security provisions of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, and for other purposes;

S. 1381. A bill to amend section 402 (c) of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, to provide more definite standards for determining who is entitled to exemption from part IV of that act as an association of shippers or a shippers' agent;

S. 1382. A bill to amend section 409 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended;

S. 1383. A bill to amend section 410 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, to require freight forwarders to obtain certificates of public convenience and necessity;

S. 1384. A bill to revise the definition of contract carrier by motor vehicle as set forth in section 203 (a) (15) of the Interstate Commerce Act, and for other purposes;

S. 1385. A bill to amend section 11 of the Clayton Antitrust Act to extend the authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission thereunder to contract carriers subject to the Interstate Commerce Act; and

S. 1386. A bill to authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to prescribe rules, standards, and instructions for the installation, inspection, maintenance, and repair of



power or train brakes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

S. 1387. A bill for the relief of Rebecca Jean Lundy (Helen Choy); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1388. A bill to allow credit or refund of gift tax erroneously paid by reason of treating nontaxable divisions of community property as gifts; and

S. 1389. A bill relating to the income-tax basis, in the hands of a surviving spouse, of certain property previously held as community property; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1390. A bill for the relief of Roberto Mario Bettinzoli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. JACKSON):

S. 1391. A bill to repeal the act of February 18, 1896, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1392. A bill to provide for increasing the storage capacity of the Bumping Lake Reservoir, Yakima River Basin, Wash.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine (for herself, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BUSH, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. IVES, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MORSE, Mr. NEUBERGER, and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 1393. A bill to authorize the National Potato Grade Labeling Act, which provides quality requirements for, and the inspection, certification, and labeling of Irish potatoes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mrs. SMITH of Maine when she introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CARLSON (for himself and Mr. BENNETT):

S. 1394. A bill to provide for the discontinuance of the Postal Savings System established by the act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 814), as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. CARLSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 1395. A bill to amend section 9 (a) of the Civil Service Retirement Act, relating to computation of annuities; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BARRETT (for himself and Mr. O'MAHONEY):

S. 1396. A bill to amend section 6 of the act approved July 10, 1890 (26 Stat. 222), relating to the admission into the Union of the State of Wyoming by providing for the use of public lands granted to said State for the purpose of construction, reconstruction, repair, renovation, furnishing, equipment, or other permanent improvement of public buildings at the capital of said State; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PURTELL:

S. 1397. A bill for the relief of Angeline Mastro Mone (Angeline Mastrolanni); and S. 1398. A bill for the relief of Anna M. Spinelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLOTT:

S. 1399. A bill for the relief of Allart Dirk Haverkamp; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1400. A bill authorizing the construction of local flood-protection works on the Mississippi River at St. Paul and South St. Paul, Minn.; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

#### PRINTING AS A SENATE DOCUMENT STUDY ENTITLED "THE RIGHT TO BUY AND ITS DENIAL TO SMALL BUSINESS"

Mr. SPARKMAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 105), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

*Resolved*, That there be printed as a Senate document a study on "The Right To Buy and Its Denial to Small Business," prepared for the Senate Select Committee on Small Business by Dr. Vernon E. Mund; and that 4,000 additional copies be printed for the use of the committee.

#### PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF COMMITTEE PRINT ENTITLED "TAX GUIDE FOR SMALL BUSI- NESS"

Mr. SPARKMAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 106), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

*Resolved*, That there be printed for the use of the Select Committee on Small Business of the Senate 6,000 additional copies of the Committee Print entitled "Tax Guide for Small Business" prepared during the 84th Congress, 2d session.

#### CIVIL PENALTIES FOR VIOLATION OF SECURITY PROVISIONS OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the imposition of civil penalties for violation of the security provisions of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting this proposed legislation, may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1380) to authorize the imposition of civil penalties for violation of the security provisions of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,  
Washington, D. C., February 18, 1957.  
Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,  
President of the Senate,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: It is requested that the enclosed draft of a bill be introduced in the Senate at your convenience. The purpose of the proposal is: "To authorize the imposition of civil penalties for violation of the security provisions of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, and for other purposes."

Following the outbreak of hostilities in Korea, legislation was enacted authorizing the Secretary of Commerce, upon the direction of the President, to exercise control of the flight of aircraft over certain areas for

national security purposes. (64 Stat. 825; title XII, Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended; 49 U. S. C. 701-705.) Thereafter, an Executive order was issued by the President (Ex. Ord. No. 10197, December 21, 1950), directing the Secretary to put the program into effect. At present the only sanctions which may be applied for violations of the security regulations which have been issued by the Secretary under that authority are either (1) suspension or revocation of the pilot's certificate in cases where the pilot is personally chargeable with the violation or against the air carrier's operating certificate where the air carrier is chargeable with the violation, or (2) in the case of willful offenses, criminal penalties. In most cases, neither of these sanctions is appropriate.

To a pilot holding an airline transport pilot or commercial rating, suspension or revocation means loss of earnings and, to the air-transport industries, loss of essential man-hours of skilled services. Suspension of the operating certificates of an air carrier means loss of essential transportation service to the Nation. These results are both inappropriate to the times and too severe for the usual offense.

Criminal penalties are even more drastic and thus even less appropriate in most of the cases presented. In any event, criminal intent is usually lacking in these cases, which generally involve some unauthorized entry into an air defense identification zone through oversight or neglect.

The civil penalty which is the normal sanction applied for minor violations of other safety provisions of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 would provide a moderate and expeditious remedy more appropriate to these technical violations. An amendment to the law is necessary to authorize the imposition of that sanction in such cases. The attached bill would provide that authority; it would amend section 901 (a) of the act so as to include within those infractions for which a civil penalty may be imposed any violation of a rule, regulation, or order issued under title XII of the act.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that it has no objection to the transmission of this letter and proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER WILLIAMS,  
Acting Secretary of Commerce.

#### PROPOSED AMENDMENTS OF INTER- STATE COMMERCE ACT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, at the request of the Interstate Commerce Commission I introduce, for appropriate reference, three bills to amend the Interstate Commerce Act. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, requesting this proposed legislation, may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bills introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (by request) were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as follows:

S. 1381. A bill to amend section 402 (c) of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, to provide more definite standards for determining who is entitled to exemption from part IV of that act as an association of shippers or a shippers' agent;

S. 1382. A bill to amend section 409 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended; and

S. 1383. A bill to amend section 410 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, to

require freight forwarders to obtain certificates of public convenience and necessity.

The letter accompanying the above bills is as follows:

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION,  
Washington, D. C., February 1, 1957.  
The Honorable WARREN G. MAGNUSON,  
Chairman, Committee on Interstate  
and Foreign Commerce, United  
States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MAGNUSON: I am submitting herewith for your consideration 20 copies each of draft bills to amend sections 402 (c), 409, and 410 of the Interstate Commerce Act, respectively, together with statements of justification therefor. The draft bills would give effect to legislative recommendations Nos. 17, 18, and 19 appearing on pages 169, 170, and 171 of the Commission's 70th annual report to Congress, as follows:

"17. We recommend that section 402 (c) be amended to make the exemption of shippers' associations and shippers' agents applicable only where the operation is that of a bona fide association or agent as defined in that section.

"18. We recommend that section 409 be amended so as to (1) place the burden of proof on the parties to contracts between freight forwarders and common carriers by motor vehicle subject to part II of the act for the transportation of freight when such contracts are called into question, (2) prohibit such contracts at compensation lower than the motor carrier's tariff rates in all cases where the line-haul transportation is for a total distance of 450 miles or more, and (3) provide penalties for the offer, grant, giving, solicitation, acceptance, or receipt of any rebate, concession, or discrimination resulting from the transportation of property at compensation less than that specified in such contract.

"19. We recommend that section 410 be amended so as to require the obtaining of a certificate of public convenience and necessity as a prerequisite to engaging in service as a freight forwarder."

We would appreciate your assistance in introducing these bills and scheduling early hearings thereon.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

OWEN CLARKE,  
Chairman.

#### JUSTIFICATION FOR RECOMMENDATION 17

The attached draft bill is designed to provide statutory standards by which the Interstate Commerce Commission may determine who is entitled to exemption, as a shippers' association or a shippers' agent, from the application of part IV of the Interstate Commerce Act.

When part IV was added to the act there were few shipper associations claiming exemption under the provisions of section 402 (c) thereof. Since then, however, especially following the court's decision in *United States v. Pacific Wholesalers Assn.* (338 U. S. 689), the number of groups and individuals purporting to do business within the purview of the exemption has greatly increased.

At present there are almost as many shippers' associations and shippers' agents engaged in consolidating and distributing freight as there are authorized freight forwarders. Many of these associations have large memberships, and their activities are nationwide and involve the movement of general commodities in substantial quantities. The regulated freight forwarders which compete with the shipper associations have, in several instances, reduced or attempted to reduce their rates to meet such competition.

Complaints are received regularly respecting the operations of self-styled shippers' associations. A number of such associations

have been investigated by the Commission's staff, and, in general, there is little distinction between the service received by a shipper from such an association and that provided by a regulated freight forwarder. In some instances former principals in forwarder businesses have been found to be prominently identified with newly established shippers' associations.

While probably a number of such individuals and groups are bona fide associations and agents, the exemption in section 402 (c) has become a loophole through which enterprising promoters are engaging essentially in a freight forwarder business under the guise of a shippers' association and are thereby evading regulation to the detriment of forwarders subject to the act.

The Commission is unable to cope with this situation effectively in the absence of statutory standards for determining who is entitled to exemption under section 402 (c). Studies made by the Commission's staff have indicated that the operations of certain self-styled shippers' associations are open to question with respect to certain features. The draft bill would provide that these features, among others, shall be considered by the Commission in determining whether a particular operation is to be exempt, or subjected to regulation. More specifically, it would amend section 402 (c) by adding thereto a new paragraph which would authorize the Commission to make the exemption of shippers' associations and shippers' agents inapplicable if it finds that their activities are not being conducted solely for the purposes, and within the limitations, specified in the provision permitting the exemption, or that such action is necessary to carry out the purposes of part IV and the provisions of the national transportation policy.

#### JUSTIFICATION FOR RECOMMENDATION 18

Under the provisions of section 409 (b) of the Interstate Commerce Act, contracts for the transportation of freight between freight forwarders subject to part IV of the act and common carriers by motor vehicle subject to part II thereof must be filed with the Commission, and the Commission has the power, after hearing, upon complaint or upon its own initiative, to prescribe the terms, conditions, and compensation of such contracts if it finds that such terms, conditions, or compensation are inconsistent with the provisions and standards set forth in paragraph (a) of section 409.

Thousands of such contracts are filed with the Commission. However, the Commission's attempts to subject certain of these contracts to formal investigation have disclosed several major defects in the law, the most important of which is the failure to place the burden of proof on the makers of such contracts when called into question.

The attached draft of bill would correct what the Commission considers this most important defect by adding a new paragraph "(c)" to section 409 providing that at any hearing involving an investigation into the terms, conditions, and compensation of any such contract the burden of proof shall be upon the parties thereto to show that such terms, conditions, and compensation are not inconsistent with the provisions and standards set forth in section 409 (a). Similar provisions respecting burden of proof may be found in sections 15 (7), 216 (g), 218 (c), 307 (g), 307 (1), and 406 (e) of the act relating to investigation and suspension of ordinary commercial rates, charges, etc.

The proposed bill would also amend paragraph (b) of section 409 by adding at the end thereof provisions which would strengthen and spell out more clearly the prescription powers of the Commission and provide it with authority to prescribe the minimum compensation which may be charged under such contracts. This amendment would al-

low the parties to change the amount of compensation to be paid so long as such amount does not go below the minimum prescribed, without petitioning the Commission for modification of its order as would be necessary if the precise amount of compensation were prescribed.

In addition, section 409 (a) would be amended by the proposed bill so as to prohibit such contracts at a compensation which is lower than the motor carrier's tariff rate in all cases where the line-haul transportation is for a total distance of 450 highway-miles or more. Under the present provisions of the statute, such prohibition applies to "line-haul transportation between concentration points and breakbulk points in truckload lots where such line-haul transportation is for 450 highway-miles or more." This amendment is proposed because (1) it is considered uneconomical for freight forwarders to utilize motor carriers to assemble and distribute forwarder traffic for distances of 450 miles or more from the forwarder's assembly and distribution stations, (2) it would prevent the circumvention of such prohibition (through the use of contract rates which are not subject to any specified minimum weights) by eliminating the term "truckload lots" and making the prohibition applicable to all cases where such line-haul distance is 450 miles or more, and (3) it would eliminate the necessity for the Commission to determine what is meant by "truckload lots" as used in the statute, a term considered almost impossible to define with exactness sufficient to stand up in court in a criminal proceeding.

New paragraphs "(d)" and "(e)" would also be added to section 409 by the proposed bill to insure better observance of the terms, conditions, and compensation of such contracts, and to provide penalties for any rebate, concession, or discrimination resulting from the transportation of property at compensation less than that specified therein. Without such provisions, freight forwarders and motor carriers could possibly violate their contracts with impunity, since there appears to be some question as to whether or not the enforcement provisions of parts II and IV of the act are applicable to this situation.

#### JUSTIFICATION FOR RECOMMENDATION 19

The attached draft bill would amend section 410 of the Interstate Commerce Act to require future applicants for freight forwarder authority to obtain a certificate of public convenience and necessity instead of a permit as a prerequisite to engaging in freight forwarding service.

At the time part IV of the Interstate Commerce Act was enacted, Congress was of the view that freight forwarder operating rights should be granted with greater liberality than the operating rights of common carriers. Accordingly, the law governing the issuance of forwarder rights was patterned after the provisions of part II of the act governing the issuance of permits to contract carriers by motor vehicle instead of those governing the issuance of certificates to common carriers. And, in order to encourage persons to enter the freight-forwarding field, section 410 (d), which has no counterpart in part II of the act, was included. Under this provision the Interstate Commerce Commission is prohibited from denying authority to engage in proposed forwarder service solely on the ground that the existing forwarder service is adequate. This provision is discussed at length in *Lipschultz Fast Freight Extension—West and Midwest* (265 I. C. C. 431).

There exist, at present, almost 100 authorized freight forwarders. Of these, five are authorized to serve virtually all points in the United States. Six others are authorized to serve all points in the United States from specified origin points, and 12 of the remaining have rights to serve all points in



more than 30 States. Others have broad authorities which generally follow existing traffic-flow patterns in the United States. A large number of freight forwarders are, therefore, now competing with each other and other carriers for the available traffic.

The ease with which permits may be obtained under the present provisions of section 410 (d) could very well result in an overcrowding of the freight forwarding field, with general impairment of forwarder service and harm to the general public. Moreover, since freight forwarders were classified as common carriers by the act of December 20, 1950 (Public Law 881, 81st Cong.), it seems appropriate that applicants for forwarder rights should be required to make a showing similar to that of other persons seeking common carrier rights.

The draft bill would, therefore, revise section 410 to require an applicant to show that the proposed service is or will be required by the present or future public convenience and necessity and would eliminate the present provisions of section 410 (d). The rights of the present holders of permits would be protected by the provision for automatic conversion of permits to certificates.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, at the request of the Interstate Commerce Commission, I introduce, for appropriate reference, three other bills to amend the Interstate Commerce Act. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, requesting this proposed legislation, may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bills introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (by request) were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as follows:

S. 1384. A bill to revise the definition of contract carrier by motor vehicle as set forth in section 203 (a) (15) of the Interstate Commerce Act, and for other purposes.

S. 1385. A bill to amend section 11 of the Clayton Antitrust Act to extend the authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission thereunder to contract carriers subject to the Interstate Commerce Act; and

S. 1386. A bill to authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to prescribe rules, standards, and instructions for the installation, inspection, maintenance, and repair of power or train brakes.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION,  
Washington, February 8, 1957.  
The Honorable WARREN G. MAGNUSON,  
Chairman, Committee on Interstate  
and Foreign Commerce, United  
States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MAGNUSON: I am submitting herewith for your consideration 20 copies each of draft bills, together with statements of justification therefor, designed to give effect to Legislative Recommendations Nos. 6, 20, and 24, appearing on pages 162, 171, and 174, respectively, of the Commission's 70th annual report to Congress as follows:

"6 (a) We recommend (1) that the definition of contract carrier by motor vehicle as set forth in section 203 (a) (15) be amended so as to state clearly the nature of the services which may be performed by such carriers and to provide that such services may be performed under continuing contracts for only one person or a limited number of persons, and (2), if so amended, that section

212 be amended by adding a new paragraph (c) authorizing the Commission to revoke the permit of such a carrier and to issue in lieu thereof a certificate of public convenience and necessity if it finds, after a hearing, that the operations of the permit holder are not those of a contract carrier under the revised definition, are those of a common carrier, and are otherwise lawful.

"(b) We also recommend that section 209 (b) be amended so as (1) to empower the Commission to limit the person or persons and the number or class of persons for which a contract carrier by motor vehicle may lawfully perform transportation services without additional authority and (2) to provide that additional permits may be issued only upon a showing that existing common carriers are unwilling or unable to provide the type of service for which a need has been shown.

"20. We recommend that section 11 of the Clayton Antitrust Act (15 U. S. C., sec. 21) be amended so as to provide that the Commission's jurisdiction thereunder shall include contract carriers as well as common carriers subject to the Interstate Commerce Act.

"24. We recommend that the Safety Appliance Acts (45 U. S. C., secs. 1-16) be amended so as to give the Commission authority to prescribe rules, standards, and instructions for the installation, inspection, maintenance, and repair of power or train brakes."

Your assistance in having these bills introduced would be very much appreciated.

With kindest regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

OWEN CLARKE, Chairman.

#### JUSTIFICATION FOR RECOMMENDATION 6

The attached draft bill would revise the definition of contract carrier by motor vehicle as set forth in section 203 (a) (15) of the Interstate Commerce Act and provide a "grandfather" clause authorizing the Interstate Commerce Commission to issue a certificate in lieu of a permit without requiring proof of public convenience and necessity if it finds that the operations of existing permit holders do not conform to the revised definition and are those of a common carrier. The proposed measure would also amend section 209 (b) of the act so as to grant the Commission authority to limit the number of contracts under which a motor contract carrier may perform transportation services without additional authority, and would further provide that additional permits may be issued only upon a showing that existing common carriers are unwilling or unable to render the required type of service.

One of the most difficult problems with which the Commission has been faced in recent years in connection with the regulation of motor carriers is the question of determining the line of demarcation to be drawn between contract carriers and common carriers. Under the present definition of contract carrier by motor vehicle in section 203 (a) (15) of the act and the proviso in section 209 (b), which specifically prohibits the Commission from restricting such carriers from substituting or adding contracts within the scope of their permits, some contract carriers have been able to effect so many contracts that they are actually performing what is tantamount to a common carrier service. The resulting diversion of traffic from the common carriers could, if continued, seriously impair their ability to render adequate service to the general public, particularly to the smaller shippers who depend almost entirely upon public transportation facilities.

The underlying purpose of the Motor Carrier Act, 1935, is to promote and protect adequate and efficient common-carrier service by motor vehicle in the public interest, and the regulation of contract carriers was de-

signed with that end in view. The purpose of the amendments proposed in the draft bill is to enable the Commission more effectively to administer the act so as to achieve the principal purpose thereof.

A contract carrier is one who has permission to engage in the transportation business on the public highways, but without the obligation to serve all persons alike. They enjoy a decided advantage in the competitive struggle for certain types of traffic. Common carriers are required to serve the general public, at their published tariff rates, without unlawful discrimination. Contract carriers, on the other hand, may pick and choose the shippers they may wish to serve and may discriminate in their charges which are required to meet a standard of only minimum reasonableness. Their costs, moreover, are substantially reduced if they have no terminals to maintain and are able to refuse to transport other than full loads, or only when return loads are available.

The position of the contract carrier in the overall transportation picture is justifiable only from the advantages which it can offer in the way of personal and specialized service for one or a limited number of shippers. It seems clear, therefore, that unless a contract carrier renders a particular shipper or a limited number of shippers a type of service different from that which existing common carriers are able or willing to provide, it should not be permitted to encroach upon the operations of the common carriers and skim off the cream of the traffic upon which the common carriers depend to support their overall service to the public.

In its administration of the act, the Commission has generally required, in granting contract carrier authority, a showing of a need for individual and specialized service, or at least dedication of equipment and facilities, under continuing bilateral contracts. The Commission has also described in permits "the business of the contract carrier and the scope thereof" in the terms of territory, commodities, and occasionally the type of equipment to be utilized. In some instances it has specified the class of shippers to be served. This is most desirable in certain cases when specifying, with particularity, the type of service for which the grant of authority was intended. Experience has indicated, however, that the Commission is in need of broader discretionary powers to enable it to specify in the permit the type and nature of the service to be performed with such particularity as to confine future service thereunder to that for which a need was shown at the time the permit was granted.

Under existing law, even though the initial grant of authority may have been based on a showing of a need for individual specialized service, there is no assurance, once a permit has been granted, against a contract carrier actively competing with and supplanting common carriers by subsequently adding a large number of contracts with other shippers. In this connection, the Supreme Court recently stated in *U. S. v. Contract Steel Carriers* (350 U. S. 409), decided March 2, 1956, that a contract carrier is free to aggressively search for new business within the limits of its license. This decision has also cast considerable doubt on the correctness of the Commission's interpretation of the act as to specialization. Freedom to solicit customers without restriction as to specialized service will tend to obliterate the distinction between common and contract carriers which Congress intended.

The amendments proposed in the draft bill would enable the Commission to give greater effect to this congressional purpose by amending the definition of contract carrier by motor vehicle to state clearly that the transportation services furnished by such carriers are to be of a special and individual nature for one or a limited number of per-

sons and which are not provided by common carriers; by specifically providing in section 209 (b) that the Commission, in granting contract carrier authority, may include terms, conditions, and limitations respecting the person or persons or the number or class thereof for which a contract carrier may perform transportation services as may be necessary to assure that the business conducted by the permit holder is that of a contract carrier and within the scope of its permit; and by removing from the proviso in section 209 (b) the prohibition against the Commission limiting the number of effective contracts which a contract carrier may have under its permit. The proposed further amendment to section 209 (b) which would permit the issuance of contract carrier operating authorities only upon a showing that existing common carriers are unwilling or unable to furnish the required type of service would serve to provide a further measure of control over unlimited expansion of contracts for nonspecialized service.

The recommended amendment to section 212 is in the nature of a "grandfather" clause authorizing the Commission to issue a certificate in lieu of a permit without proof of convenience and necessity where it finds the operations of existing permit holders do not conform to the revised definition, are those of a common carrier, and are otherwise lawful.

The proposed new subsection (c) to section 203, prohibiting the performance of for-hire motor carrier transportation in interstate or foreign commerce without a certificate or permit from the Commission, is necessary because under the proposed revision of the motor contract carrier definition certain types of operations formerly included in the definition would be excluded therefrom, not all of which would come within the definition of effective contracts which a contract carrier may have under its permit. The proposed further amendment to section 209 (b) which would permit the issuance of contract carrier operating authorities only upon a showing that existing common carriers are unwilling or unable to furnish the required type of service would serve to provide a further measure of control over unlimited expansion of contracts for nonspecialized service.

The recommended amendment to section 212 is in the nature of a grandfather clause authorizing the Commission to issue a certificate in lieu of a permit without proof of convenience and necessity where it finds the operations of existing permit holders do not conform to the revised definition, are those of a common carrier, and are otherwise lawful.

The proposed new subsection (c) to section 203, prohibiting the performance of for-hire motor carrier transportation in interstate or foreign commerce without a certificate or permit from the Commission, is necessary because under the proposed revision of the motor contract carrier definition certain types of operations formerly included in the definition would be excluded therefrom, not all of which would come within the definition of common carrier by motor vehicle as set forth in section 203 (a) (14) of the act. In the absence of such a provision, anyone engaging in motor transportation for compensation, either with or without a permit, which is not that of a common carrier because not held out to the general public, or for other reasons, and which is not within the amended and restricted definition of a contract carrier would not be subject to regulation by the Commission as either a common or a contract carrier. Presumably such person would also be able to engage in such operations without being subject to any regulation whatever, not even to the safety and hours of service regulations which are applicable to private carriers. Without

this proposed provision the proposed amendments would not accomplish the intended result.

It should be noted in this connection that if the second proviso in section 206 (a) (1) of the act is repealed, as recommended by the Commission in its 70th Annual Report (Legislative Recommendation No. 9), the reference thereto in proposed new section 203 (c) in the attached draft bill should be stricken.

#### JUSTIFICATION FOR RECOMMENDATION 20

The attached draft bill is designed to make the authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission under section 11 of the Clayton Antitrust Act applicable to contract as well as to common carriers subject to the Interstate Commerce Act.

At the time the Clayton Act was passed, the Commission had jurisdiction under the Interstate Commerce Act only over certain common carriers, principally common carriers by railroad. Since that time it has been given jurisdiction over various other common carriers, and also over contract carriers by motor vehicle and by water. The Commission's jurisdiction under section 11 of the Clayton Act, however, still applies only to common carriers subject to the Interstate Commerce Act. It appears, therefore, under the present provisions of section 11, that jurisdiction over the acquisition by one corporation of stock in another corporation, where the effect would be to substantially lessen competition, would be in the Federal Trade Commission where contract carriers are involved, while at the same time the Interstate Commerce Commission would have jurisdiction under section 5 of the Interstate Commerce Act over the establishment of common control of two or more contract carriers.

Under section 5 of the Interstate Commerce Act, the standards prescribed and used in determining whether or not a proposed transaction, within the scope thereof, should be approved by the Commission are different from those used by the Department of Justice and other agencies in determining whether or not any violations of the Clayton Act or other antitrust laws have been committed. This is necessarily so because a regulated industry is involved, which regulation in itself protects the public interest.

Inasmuch as the Interstate Commerce Commission has jurisdiction over various activities and practices of contract carriers, and the issuance and transfer of permits authorizing the operation thereof, it seems logical and appropriate that the Commission should also administer the Clayton Act with respect to contract carriers as well as common carriers subject to the Interstate Commerce Act. This would make for greater uniformity in the application of the Clayton Act to the transportation industry and would also serve to avoid the possibility of conflicting requirements being imposed upon such carriers by the different agencies.

#### JUSTIFICATION FOR RECOMMENDATION 24

The attached draft bill would give the Interstate Commerce Commission authority to establish rules, standards, and instructions for the installation, inspection, maintenance, and repair of power or train brakes.

Under section 3 of the act of March 2, 1903 (45 U. S. C., sec. 10), the Commission is charged with the responsibility of enforcing the power or train brake provisions of the Safety Appliance Acts (45 U. S. C., secs. 1-16). It does not, however, have the authority to prescribe rules, standards, and instructions for the installation, inspection, maintenance, and repair of such equipment. (Promulgation and Enforcement of Rules, Standards, and Instructions for Installation, Inspection, Maintenance and Repair of Power

Brakes, — I. C. C. —, Docket No. 31938, decided January 3, 1957.)

Section 1 of the act of March 2, 1893 (45 U. S. C., sec. 1) provides, in part, that it shall be unlawful to run any train that does not have a sufficient number of cars equipped with power or train brakes so that the engineer of the locomotive drawing the train can control its speed without requiring brakemen to use the common hand brake for that purpose, and section 2 of the act of March 2, 1903 (45 U. S. C., sec. 9) provides that any train which is operated with power or train brakes shall have such brakes on 50 percent of such cars used and operated by the engineer and all power brake cars associated together with such 50 percent shall have their brakes so used and operated. The Commission's order of June 6, 1910, increased this percentage to 85. Subsequent orders of the Commission requiring, with certain exceptions, the installation of power brakes on all cars has had the effect of increasing this percentage to 100 percent.

Since almost all cars are now equipped with power or train brakes, all such cars associated together must have their brakes used and operated. Inoperative train brakes associated together with operative brakes are in violation of the law. To assure compliance with the law, some method must be adopted to determine if each such brake is operative. The only way in which this determination can be made is by actual visual inspection of each brake after the cars are assembled in the train.

Because of the nature of the power or train brakes, rigid maintenance standards must be maintained in order to assure operative brakes. The design of these brakes is such that their efficiency is dependent upon correctness of adjustment. A train brake may be operative, but in such poor adjustment that its braking effect is practically nonexistent.

In order to insure that power or train brakes are kept in proper adjustment and properly maintained, and to insure efficient operative brakes, the Commission in 1925 cooperated with the mechanical division of the Association of American Railroads in the formulation of a code of rules for maintaining and testing air brakes. This code, which has been revised from time to time, represents minimum requirements for inspection, maintenance, and repair of train brakes. It was last revised in 1953. The Association of American Railroads, however, has no authority to require adoption of the code by the carriers or to enforce compliance with its rules; nor is there any provision in the law requiring compliance with these rules. Each railroad is free to adopt, amend, or disregard the rules in whole or in part. Some railroads have adopted standards equal to or more exacting than the code, while others have chosen to adopt rules which do not meet the minimum requirements. Even among those railroads that have adopted the association's code, there is widespread noncompliance of the rules, particularly with respect to train brake inspections.

During the fiscal year ended June 30, 1956, the Commission's inspectors made train-brake inspections on 2,484 trains, consisting of 117,399 cars, before departing from terminals. A total of 8,007 cars were found to have inoperative or inefficient airbrakes. Of this number, 3,221 were detached from the train and the airbrakes subsequently repaired, 4,634 had their airbrakes repaired while still in the train, and 152 with inoperative airbrakes were allowed by the carriers to depart in the trains. These trains had been prepared for departure by the carrier's employees, yet when afterward tested by the Commission's inspectors it was necessary to set out or repair the brakes on an average of 3.16 cars per train, and 6.7 cars per hundred were found with defective train brakes. Air-brake tests were also made on 1,588 trains,



consisting of 96,962 cars upon arrival at terminals. Brakes were found to be operative on 94,879 cars in these trains, or on 79.9 percent thereof. Of these operative, however, 8,867, or 9.14 cars out of every 100 inspected, had train brakes with impaired efficiency due to excessive piston travel.

During the same fiscal year the Commission's inspectors observed many instances where the minimum requirements of the association's code had not been met. These matters were brought to the attention of the railroad managements involved, but with little or no improvement.

The records of the Commission indicate a progressive deterioration of train brake inspection and maintenance practices. It is therefore apparent that the carriers are either unable to enforce their own rules or are deliberately ignoring minimum requirements for safety.

In the past the railroads have generally cooperated with Government inspectors in the administration of the Safety Appliance Acts. Recently, however, several instances of lack of such cooperation have been reported. Our inspectors have been deliberately prevented from making train-brake inspections at certain terminals. This has been done by not providing the inspectors the opportunity to make their inspections, or by permitting the trains to depart before their examinations of the train brakes have been completed, notwithstanding that delays resulting from such inspections are trifling.

The industry's self-imposed rules have not produced the desired results. The Commission believes that the problem can be met by giving it statutory authority to prescribe and enforce adequate power and train brake rules. It is therefore urged that the Safety Appliance Acts be amended as proposed in the draft bill in order to provide the degree of safety contemplated therein for employees and the traveling public.

#### PROPOSED NATIONAL POTATO GRADE LABELING ACT

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, my colleague, the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], and Senators AIKEN, ALLOTT, BARRETT, BRIDGES, BUSH, CHAVEZ, DWORSHAK, IVES, JAVITS, MAGNUSON, MANSFIELD, MORSE, NEUBERGER, and YOUNG, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill relating to the quality requirements for, and the inspection, certification, and labeling of, Irish potatoes. I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie on the desk through Friday next, to permit any Senator who desires to cosponsor it to do so.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Maine.

The bill (S. 1393) to authorize the National Potato Grade Labeling Act, which provides quality requirements for, and the inspection, certification, and labeling of Irish potatoes, introduced by Mrs. SMITH of Maine (for herself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

#### DISCONTINUANCE OF POSTAL SAVINGS SYSTEM

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill providing

for the discontinuance of the Postal Savings System.

The Postal Savings System was established by an act of Congress on June 25, 1910, and has rendered a useful service. I think, however, that on the basis of a decline in deposits and the number of depositors, it has become increasingly uneconomic in its operation. This is because fixed overhead remains relatively stable, and offices with few depositors must maintain records, file reports, and account for balances and for certificates, and so forth.

It is interesting to note that the amount on deposit as of June 30, 1956, dropped to \$1,765 million from \$3,393 million on June 30, 1947, or a decrease of about 50 percent. The decline for the past 3 years has been well in excess of \$200 million a year.

The number of depositors has dropped from a peak of 4,196,517, as of June 30, 1947, to 2,482,026 depositors, as of June 30, 1956. For the past 3 fiscal years, respectively, the number of accounts closed out have been 228,000, 223,000, and 229,000.

The convenience of the public no longer seems to be served as it was at the time of the creation of the Postal Savings System in 1910. At that time there was no protection of depositor savings in the case of the failure of a bank.

The Postal Savings System provided a convenient means whereby savings could be deposited at earned interest with complete assurance of repayment by the Government. Since then, however, this assurance to the public is now provided through the availability of United States savings bonds, which earn interest, and through the guaranty by agencies of the Government of bank and of savings and loan deposits.

At the time of enactment of the Postal Savings Act, in 1910, the convenience of small-town patrons was undoubtedly taken into consideration. This is not so important today, when less than 2 percent of the aggregate deposits and of all depositors are served by third-class and fourth-class post offices. In fact, the fourth-class post-office depositors account for only one-fiftieth of 1 percent of all depositors. Ninety percent of the depositors are in first-class offices, and 8½ percent are in second-class offices. Thus, deposits are concentrated in post offices in communities which have commercial banks. For the very few which do not, the growth of automobile transportation since 1910 and the increased popularity of banking by mail have provided ready alternatives.

The Comptroller General of the United States in his reports to Congress on the survey and audit of the Postal Savings System has consistently concluded that the purpose and justification of the system are no longer applicable, and has consistently recommended that the Congress give consideration to the further need for the System.

The Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government recommended, in May 1955, that a plan for orderly discontinuance of the Postal Savings System be inaugurated. In prior Congresses, bills calling for the

abrupt termination of the Postal Savings System have been introduced.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Kansas whether he has looked into the matter of the small depositors in the banks of the Nation during the past 3 or 4 years.

Mr. CARLSON. Let me say to the distinguished chairman of my committee that I have not done so, but I have followed with interest the record of postal savings.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should like to have printed in the RECORD a statement showing what the personal savings have been. I shall furnish the statement in the near future. I may say the records show that personal savings have dropped while the Nation as a whole has been prospering, which is an indication that the small people are not prospering at this time.

Mr. CARLSON. I think it would be very helpful to have that information printed in the RECORD.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I have been associated with my colleague, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], as one of the sponsors of the bill. I was its original sponsor in 1952, as a result of a statement made at that time by the Comptroller of the Currency—namely, that, in his opinion, the usefulness of the Postal Savings System had ended. That was 5 years ago.

If the deposits continue to drop, the burden on the Department will continue to increase. Furthermore, because the interest rates being paid by the banks and savings and loan associations are so much higher than the rates paid by the Postal Savings System, I also hope that the transfer can be made with a minimum of inconvenience.

I think this service has been very valuable, but I feel that it has outlived its usefulness. I hope that when the time comes, the Senate will pass the bill which the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] has introduced today, on behalf of himself and myself.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I think I should make clear that in the statement I made a moment ago, I was not opposing the bill as chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Certainly we shall hold hearings on the bill. In making my statement, I was only pointing out that the deposits by the small depositors of the Nation have been decreasing.

Mr. CARLSON. I appreciate the statement the Senator from South Carolina has made. We are confident that he, as chairman of the committee, will have ample hearings held on the bill; otherwise we would not have introduced it.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with an explanation of it, may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and explanation will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1394) to provide for the discontinuance of the Postal Savings System established by the act of June 25,

1910 (36 Stat. 814), as amended, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CARLSON (for himself and Mr. BENNETT), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That (a) the 30th day after the date of the enactment of this act is hereby established as the closing date for the Postal Savings System created by the act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 814), as amended, and thereafter no deposits shall be accepted in any existing postal savings account nor shall any new postal savings accounts be opened.

(b) Commencing with the 30th day after the date of the enactment of this act, interest on all postal savings deposits shall cease to accrue on the interest anniversary date of each outstanding deposit certificate.

SEC. 2. After June 30, 1958, the total amount of the unpaid deposits, including the accrued interest due thereon as shown by the books of the Board of Trustees of the Postal Savings System shall be transferred to the Secretary of the Treasury, who shall deposit the sum so transferred under the authority of this section in the trust fund receipt account in the Treasury as "unclaimed moneys of individuals whose whereabouts are unknown (postal savings)." Expenditures are authorized to be made from this account as provided by section 17 (a) of the act of June 26, 1934 (48 Stat. 1230; 31 U. S. C. 725p).

SEC. 3. In order to facilitate the settlement of the account of a depositor who cannot be located or who is deceased, the amount to the credit of such depositor, including such interest as may be due thereon, shall be paid in the following order of precedence, and such payment shall be a bar to recovery by any other person of amounts so paid:

First, to the spouse of such depositor;

Second, if there be no surviving spouse, to the child or children of such depositor, and descendants of deceased children, by representation;

Third, if none of the above, to the parents of such depositor, or survivor of them; and

Fourth, if there be none of the above, to the duly appointed legal representative of such depositor, or if there be none, to the person or persons determined by the Board of Trustees of the Postal Savings System to be entitled thereto under the laws of the State in which the deposit was made.

SEC. 4. Where any payment of a postal savings account, including such interest as may be due thereon, is to be made to a minor, except in the case of an account maintained by a minor in his own name in accordance with section 4 of the act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 815) or to a person mentally incompetent or under other legal disability adjudged by a court of competent jurisdiction, such payment may be made to the person who is constituted guardian or other fiduciary by the law of the State of residence of such claimant or is otherwise legally vested with the care of the claimant or his estate. Where no guardian or other fiduciary of the person under legal disability has been appointed under the laws of the State of residence of the claimant, the Board of Trustees of the Postal Savings System shall determine the person who is otherwise legally vested with the care of the claimant or his estate. Payments made under this section shall be a bar to recovery by any other person of amounts so made.

SEC. 5. To facilitate the liquidation of the Postal Savings System, the Secretary of the Treasury shall redeem or purchase the public debt obligations of the United States, held for the account of the Postal Savings System, at their par value whenever it will not be advantageous to sell such public debt obligations on the regular market.

SEC. 6. Until June 30, 1958, the Postmaster General shall continue to cover into the postal revenues the excess of interest and profit occurring from the deposit or investment of postal savings funds after the payment of interest due depositors in the Postal Savings System.

SEC. 7. The Board of Trustees of the Postal Savings System, commencing with the 30th day after the enactment of this act, shall not be required to maintain the 5-percent reserve of postal savings funds required to be maintained by the provisions of section 9 of the act of 1910 as contained in section 2 of the act of May 18, 1916 (39 Stat. 159), as amended.

SEC. 8. Effective June 30, 1958, all powers, functions, and duties vested in the Board of Trustees and in the Postmaster General by the act of June 25, 1910, as amended, shall be and are hereby transferred to the Secretary of the Treasury for the purpose of completing the liquidation of the Postal Savings System.

SEC. 9. The Board of Trustees is hereby authorized and directed to prescribe such rules and regulations and make such delegation of authority as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

The explanation presented by Mr. CARLSON is as follows:

#### ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ON POSTAL SAVINGS BILL

##### EXPLANATION

Section 1 of the bill establishes the 30th day after enactment as the date upon which the Board of Trustees will close the Postal Savings System. After that date, no deposits in existing accounts will be accepted and no new accounts will be opened. Interest will cease to run on all outstanding certificates on their anniversary date falling between 30 days after enactment and June 30, 1958.

Section 2 of the bill provides for the transfer of the records and unpaid deposits, including the accrued interest as shown by the books of the Board of Trustees to the Secretary of the Treasury. He will deposit the sums in the trust fund known as Unclaimed Moneys of Individuals Whose Whereabouts Are Unknown (Postal Savings).

Section 3 sets up a descent and distribution table for the payment of accounts to the representatives of deceased depositors. In the absence of this, we would be required to observe the laws of each State with respect to the descent and distribution, administration of estates, and similar provisions of State law. It would hamper us tremendously in the orderly closing out of the accounts of the postal savings if we have to apply the various laws of the States.

Section 4 is a special provision with respect to the payment of postal savings accounts to minors.

Section 5 of the bill provides that the Secretary of the Treasury shall redeem or purchase public debt obligations of the United States which are held for the account of the Postal Savings System at their par value whenever it is not advantageous to sell them on the regular market. I am sure you will appreciate that a serious situation could occur if we were forced to sell our securities purchased with depositors' moneys at less than par.

Section 6 provides that any interest accruing on bank accounts and from securities over and above that necessary to pay the interest due to depositors will be covered into the postal revenues during the liquidation year.

Section 7 authorizes the immediate use of the 5-percent cash reserve now maintained in the Department of the Treasury. This will, of course, make ready cash available for liquidation purposes.

Section 8 merely provides for a shifting of all powers and duties of the Board of Trus-

tees to the Secretary of the Treasury for the completion of liquidation.

Section 9 authorizes the Board of Trustees to issue rules and regulations and to make delegations of authority to accomplish the objectives of the law.

#### CONSTRUCTION OF FLOOD PROTECTION WORKS ON MISSISSIPPI RIVER AT ST. PAUL AND SOUTH ST. PAUL, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill authorizing the construction of local flood-protection works on the Mississippi River at St. Paul and South St. Paul, Minn. I wish to make a brief statement relating to the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1400) authorizing the construction of local flood-protection works on the Mississippi River at St. Paul and South St. Paul, Minn., introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, during 1951 and 1952 two savage floods—the latest in a long series of lesser floods—devastated large areas of the cities of St. Paul and South St. Paul, situated at approximately the confluence of the Mississippi and Minnesota Rivers at a point where the Mississippi River becomes for the first time a formidable stream.

One would not expect that a flood so far upstream could cause such severe damage as the Mississippi River did in St. Paul and South St. Paul in 1951 and 1952, and which it has with considerable frequency caused throughout the more than 100 years of St. Paul's existence.

Yet it is a fact that the damage to private property and the cost of restoration efforts in the west side of St. Paul following the 1952 flood was estimated at \$3,160,000. This, I point out, is substantially the same as the estimated Federal cost for the St. Paul section of a proposed project to provide flood-protection works for the west side of St. Paul and for the city of South St. Paul.

A study and report by the district and division engineers covering a proposed flood-control project at St. Paul and South St. Paul was approved by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors on January 28, 1957. This approved report will, within a few days, be sent to State and local authorities and to other Federal agencies for review, which can be expected to take place within 3 weeks.

Estimated Federal costs of the twin project are \$3,137,700 for St. Paul, and \$2,567,700 for South St. Paul.

I wish to emphasize that not only has it been thoroughly demonstrated that a flood in the west side of St. Paul can cause, and has caused, more than \$3 million in damages in a few short days, but that a flood in the industrial section of South St. Paul—a few miles downstream—strikes the site of the second largest livestock market in the Nation. Thus, not only is there extensive damage and suffering to the immediate inhabitants of South St. Paul, but it also causes



the serious disruption of an industry which serves a hinterland comprising 14 States and 3 provinces of Canada.

For these reasons I feel it necessary to bring this urgent flood-control project before the Congress at the earliest practicable moment, in the hope that it will be possible to include authorization for the project during the present session of Congress.

#### TAX RELIEF FOR SMALL BUSINESS— ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, on January 7, 1957, for myself and Senators IVES, BEALL, CAPEHART, BRICKER, and BUSH, I introduced the bill (S. 245) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 in order to provide tax relief in small corporations and more equitable tax treatment for persons engaged in small businesses. This bill would, if enacted, implement the small-business tax recommendations of the President's Cabinet Committee Report on Small Business issued last August.

My good friend, the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], who shares our interest in small-business tax problems, has indicated his desire to cosponsor this bill. I am happy, indeed, to ask unanimous consent that the name of the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER] be added to the list of cosponsors of Senate bill 245.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### INCREASED PENSIONS TO CERTAIN ANNUITANTS

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, on yesterday I introduced a bill to increase the compensation of certain annuitants. The bill has been designated as S. 1355, and has been referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. In my remarks on yesterday, I requested, at the conclusion of my statement, unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the body of the RECORD. However, although my remarks were printed in the RECORD, the text of the bill was not printed in the RECORD. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that in today's RECORD there be printed both my remarks on the bill and the text of the bill itself.

There being no objection, the statement and bill were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil-service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes.

In introducing this bill I desire to call attention to the fact that those who are having the most difficult time today in gaining the necessities of life, and in paying their way of livelihood, are persons with small fixed incomes, and particularly older people who are confronted with the costs of living without capacity to add to their incomes.

The bill would give to all annuitants under civil service a reasonable increase, and in particular it would take care of those who were not covered in the increase of 1948.

I therefore introduce the bill, and ask that it be appropriately referred, and I hope that

at an early date the Congress will enact it into law. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the body of the RECORD following my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1355) to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil-service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. REVERCOMB, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Senate bill 1355, introduced by Mr. REVERCOMB is as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That (a) the annuity of each individual who, on October 1, 1956, was receiving or entitled to receive an annuity from the civil-service retirement and disability fund shall, in addition to any increase in such annuity heretofore provided by law, be further increased, effective on the effective date of this act, in accordance with the following schedule:

If annuity commenced on or after—	Portion of annuity not in excess of \$1,500 shall be increased by—	Portion of annuity in excess of \$1,500 shall be increased by—
October 1, 1955, and prior to October 1, 1956.	25 per centum.	10 per centum.
October 1, 1954, and prior to October 1, 1955.	26 per centum.	10 per centum.
October 1, 1953, and prior to October 1, 1954.	27 per centum.	10 per centum.
October 1, 1952, and prior to October 1, 1953.	28 per centum.	10 per centum.
October 1, 1951, and prior to October 1, 1952.	29 per centum.	10 per centum.
August 20, 1950, and prior to October 1, 1951.	30 per centum.	10 per centum.

(b) No increase provided by subsection (a) shall exceed \$756 per annum for any individual or be computed on any part of the annuity purchased by voluntary contributions. Except as provided in subsections (c) and (d), the increases provided by this section when added to the annuities of retired employees shall not operate to increase the annuities of their survivors.

(c) The annuity of a widow, widower, or designated survivor annuitant of an individual referred to in subsection (a), which (i) is payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund, (ii) is based on the service of such individual, and (iii) commences after October 1, 1956, shall be increased, effective on the beginning date of such annuity or on the effective date of this act, whichever is later, by such amount if any as may be necessary to provide such widow, widower, or designated survivor annuitant with an annuity equal to one-half of the annuity which such individual was receiving at the date of his death excluding any part thereof purchased by voluntary contributions, but such increased annuity in the case of a widow or widower of an individual who retired prior to April 1, 1948, shall not exceed \$756.

(d) The annuity of each surviving child of an individual referred to in subsection (a), which (i) is payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund, (ii) is based on the service of such individual, and (iii) commences after October 1, 1956, shall be increased, effective on the beginning date of such annuity or on the effective date of this act, whichever is later, by such amount if any as may be necessary to provide each such child with an annuity which—

(A) in any case in which such individual is survived by a widow, shall be equal to one-fourth of the annuity which such individual

was receiving at the date of his death (excluding any part thereof purchased by voluntary contributions), except that no such increased annuity shall exceed the lesser of \$1,200 divided by the number of such children or \$600; or

(B) in any case in which such individual is not survived by a widow, shall be equal to one-half of the annuity which such individual was receiving at the date of his death (excluding any part thereof purchased by voluntary contributions), except that no such increased annuity shall exceed the lesser of \$1,500 divided by the number of such children or \$720.

SEC. 2. The limitation contained in the last sentence of section 8 (d) (1) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, as enacted by the act of August 11, 1955 (69 Stat. 692; Public Law 369, 84th Cong.), is repealed effective as of August 11, 1955, but no increase in annuity shall accrue by reason of the enactment of this section for any period prior to the effective date of this act. In computing, for the purposes of subsections (c) and (d) of section 1, the amount of annuity which an individual who died after September 30, 1956, and prior to the effective date of this act was receiving at the date of his death there shall be included any amount which he would have received had this section been enacted prior to such death.

SEC. 3. The widow of an employee where such employee had completed 20 or more years of Federal service and was subject to the provisions of the Civil Service Retirement Act, the Canal Zone Retirement Act, or the Alaska Railroad Retirement Act at the time of his death, before April 1, 1948, while in the service of the United States or retired from such service, on or before such date, if such widow had been legally married to such employee or retiree for a period of at least 10 years prior to his death and was not entitled to any annuity based upon the service of such employee or retiree under any other provisions of the Civil Service Retirement Act and has not remarried, shall be entitled to receive an annuity equal to one-half of the annuity to which such employee or retiree would have been entitled to receive under the annuity computation formula in effect at the time of his death or received (excluding any part thereof purchased by voluntary contributions), but not to exceed \$756 per annum. Any annuity granted to a survivor under this section shall commence on the first day of the month following the month in which application therefor has been duly filed with the Civil Service Commission, and shall cease upon the death, or remarriage, of the annuitant.

SEC. 4. The monthly installment of any annuity increased or provided by this act shall be fixed at the nearest dollar.

SEC. 5. The annuities and increases in annuities provided by this act shall be paid from the civil service retirement and disability fund; but such annuities and increases in annuities shall terminate on the 30th day of June of any calendar year, after the calendar year 1959, in which an appropriation shall not have been made by the Congress prior to July 31 of such year to compensate such fund for the cost, as determined by the United States Civil Service Commission, of such annuities and increases in annuities during the fiscal year ending on June 30 of the following calendar year. After such termination the preceding sections of this act shall not be in effect and annuities and increases in annuities within the purview of this act shall be determined and paid in the same manner as immediately prior to the effective date of this act and as though this act had not been enacted.

SEC. 6. This act shall take effect on the first day of the second calendar month following the date of enactment of this act.

# ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

Address entitled "United States Foreign Policy Today and Tomorrow," delivered by him at Georgetown University on February 25, 1957.

By Mr. McNAMARA:

Statement prepared by him discussing Federal aid for school construction.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

Remarks made by him before Bernalillo County Democratic Convention, Albuquerque, N. Mex., on February 18, 1957.

## NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON SENATE BILL 11, TO AMEND SECTION 2 (B) OF THE ROBINSON-PATMAN ACT

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly Legislation of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that public hearings have been scheduled to commence on Tuesday, March 12, 1957, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, on S. 11, a bill to amend section 2 (b) of the Robinson-Patman Act so as to provide that the good-faith defense is not a substantive defense when the discriminatory price practices are of such magnitude as to tend to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly in any line of commerce.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNING], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and myself as chairman.

## NOTICE OF HEARING ON H. R. 2528, TO AUTHORIZE THE SALE OF THE GOVERNMENT-OWNED ALCOHOL BUTADIENE FACILITY AT LOUISVILLE, KY., KNOWN AS PLANCOR 1207

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on behalf of the Subcommittee on Production and Stabilization of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, I desire to give notice that a public hearing will be held on the bill H. R. 2528, to authorize the sale of the Government-owned alcohol butadiene facility at Louisville, Ky., known as Plancor 1207, on Thursday, March 7, 1957, at 10 a. m., in room 301, Senate Office Building.

All persons who desire to appear and testify at this hearing are requested to notify Mr. J. H. Yingling, chief clerk, Committee on Banking and Currency, room 303, Senate Office Building, telephone National 8-3120, extension 865, as soon as possible.

## STATEMENT BY SENATOR KNOWLAND, A UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE TO THE UNITED NATIONS, CONCERNING COMPLAINT BY SOVIET RUSSIA

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the text of a statement I made yesterday in the United Nations Special Political Committee in my capacity as United States Representative on the Special Committee, and speaking in behalf of the Government of the United States in answer to a complaint by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics relative to the Government of the United States.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILLIAM S. KNOWLAND, UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE IN THE SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE ON THE SOVIET ITEM ENTITLED "COMPLAINT BY THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS OF INTERVENTION BY THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA IN THE DOMESTIC AFFAIRS OF ALBANIA, BULGARIA, CZECHOSLOVAKIA, HUNGARY, POLAND, RUMANIA, AND THE U. S. S. R., AND ITS SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITY AGAINST THOSE STATES"

Mr. Chairman, the torrent of abuse against my country which the Soviet Union has launched in recent months is nothing new. It is a disagreeable old story brought up to date.

We Americans naturally dislike hearing our country attacked from any quarter. But we know that what the Soviet representative says, like many accusations he has made here in the past, will be recognized as false by this General Assembly and by the whole free world.

Most of these charges by the Soviet Union are familiar in the United Nations. The Soviet representative himself has noted that fact. As he said, his country put forward many of them in the General Assembly in 1951. And they were rejected by the Assembly—he forgot to mention this—on January 10, 1952, by a vote of 42 to 5. The wide variety of other false and sensational accusations which his delegation has brought against my country here nearly every year for 10 years past has likewise been rejected, and by overwhelming majorities. In this process the very term "Soviet item" has become a synonym to United Nations delegations for a propaganda offensive against the United States.

By reviving these charges, the Soviet Union is merely trying to divert world attention from its own year-in and year-out program of using foreign Communist parties to subvert and undermine the government of free countries all over the world. Also, no doubt, the Soviet Union would like to obscure the truth revealed in recent discussions by the Assembly of the situation in Hungary, and for that purpose produces its own myth of United States intervention in Eastern Europe. Once again we call upon the Soviet Union to permit free access to Eastern Europe, and thus to the facts.

It is well to remember that a story does not become true merely by being detailed. Often here in the General Assembly the Soviet delegation has produced reams of material to support charges they thought it expedient to make, but always the charges have been discredited and rejected.

We regret that the Assembly's time must be taken up by these well-known charges, particularly now when new grave international problems need to be discussed, but the United States appreciates this opportunity

to clarify matters once again. When we are falsely accused we cannot remain silent.

Naturally, we would like to see improved and different conditions in Eastern Europe. We shall never cease to hope that the now captive peoples will be permitted to enjoy those fundamental rights and freedoms recognized in the United Nations Charter. If we can say or do something here that can help to reassure our Soviet colleagues that our motives and policies in no way menace Soviet security, and indeed, that they reflect an objective on which all must agree—to preserve and maintain international peace—this discussion will have served a useful purpose.

## II. UNITED STATES AIMS TOWARD EASTERN EUROPE

Mr. Chairman, it is necessary at the outset to put the record straight about United States policy. As the Soviet Government knows, the chief spokesmen of United States foreign policy are the President of the United States and the Secretary of State. They are the sources to whom I shall refer in this discussion.

In Moscow's picture of United States policies regarding Eastern Europe there are two chief distortions. One of these is the idea that the United States wants to impose its political and economic ideas on Eastern Europe. That is untrue. In a speech at Dallas, Tex., on October 27, 1956, Secretary Dulles said:

"The captive peoples should never have reason to doubt that they have in us a sincere and dedicated friend who shares their aspirations. They must know that they can draw upon our abundance to tide themselves over the period of economic adjustment which is inevitable as they rededicate their productive efforts to the service of their own people, rather than that of exploiting masters. Nor do we condition economic ties between us upon the adoption by these countries of any particular form of society."

The second Moscow distortion, even graver in its import, is that we want to turn the Eastern European countries into military allies or even military bases from which to attack the Soviet Union. In the same address at Dallas Secretary Dulles said:

"And let me make this clear, beyond a possibility of doubt! The United States has no ulterior purpose in desiring the independence of the satellite countries. Our unadulterated wish is that these people, from whom so much of our national life derives, should have sovereignty restored to them, and that they should have governments of their own free choosing. We do not look upon these nations as potential military allies. We see them as friends and as part of a new and friendly and no longer divided Europe."

Further on this point, President Eisenhower in his television report to the Nation last October 31 said:

"We have also—with respect to the Soviet Union—sought clearly to remove any false fears that we would look upon new governments in these Eastern European countries as potential military allies. We have no such ulterior purpose. We see these peoples as friends, and we wish simply that they be friends who are free."

Again on December 18 in his press conference in Washington, Secretary Dulles emphasized that we have no wish to turn these countries into our allies. He continued:

"The United States is very openminded to any suggestions that might be made as to the status—whether neutralization or otherwise—of satellite countries which would take away any fear, I would hope, by the Soviet Union that it would be physically or militarily endangered if it facilitated this evolution to independence."

Mr. Chairman, once again the Soviet Union seems determined to misrepresent the United



States as a power bent on conquest by producing its familiar file of press clippings which prove nothing. But if the Soviet leaders honestly seek to know that the true purposes of the United States are toward Eastern Europe and the entire world, I suggest they study without prejudgment the statements I have just quoted. I suggest also that they study with equal seriousness the inaugural address of President Eisenhower a month ago, in which he said:

"We honor the aspirations of those nations which, now captive, long for freedom. We seek neither their military alignment nor any artificial integration with our society. And they can know the warmth of the welcome that awaits them when, as must be, they join again the ranks of freedom."

"We honor no less in this divided world than in a less tormented time, the people of Russia. We do not dread—rather do we welcome—their progress in education and industry. We wish them success in their demands for more intellectual freedom, greater security before their own laws, fuller enjoyment of the rewards of their own toil. And as such things may come to pass, the more certain will be the coming of that day when our peoples may freely meet in friendship."

### III. TRUE SOURCES OF TENSION IN EASTERN EUROPE

Mr. Chairman, what I have said makes it clear enough that there is nothing in United States policy in which the Soviet Union can find cause for alarm. Obviously we must look elsewhere to find the true causes of tension and unrest in Eastern Europe. Recent tragic events in Hungary illustrate conclusively the root of the problem—the complete and total suppression of every expression of independence which the Soviets, in their psychopathic concern for security, regard as a threat to their control of the area.

How did this state of affairs come to pass in Eastern Europe? It came about as a result of the aggressive policies and repressive actions of the Soviet Union for nearly two decades.

The Soviet Union has denied the legitimate aspirations of the peoples of Eastern Europe for national independence.

The Soviet Union has denied to these peoples basic human freedoms recognized in the Charter of the United Nations.

The Soviet Union has imposed puppet governments on the states of Eastern Europe and has used its armed forces to keep those governments in power.

The Soviet Union has plundered the economies of these countries for the benefit of the Soviet state.

The Soviet Union converted the three Baltic Republics of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania into Soviet Provinces in violation of their solemn treaties of friendship and non-aggression.

The Soviet Union has built up large satellite armies staffed by Soviet officers.

The Soviet Union has cut off the captive peoples from contact with the free world by monopolizing all channels of communications.

The Soviet Union has filled the newspapers and schoolbooks of Eastern Europe with "Hate America" slogans.

The Soviet Union has persecuted the churches and intimidated and harassed those who worship God.

The Soviet Union has erected physical barriers against escape, including barbed wire, mine fields, and lookout towers.

The peoples of this area unceasingly seek ways and means of piercing this Iron Curtain which separates them from contact with the rest of the world. Clearly it is the Soviet Union which has intervened directly in the internal affairs of the countries of Eastern Europe.

These, Mr. Chairman, are some of the major sources of tension in Eastern Europe. All of them arise from the actions and poli-

cies of the Soviet Union itself. Were it to change these actions and policies, the Soviet Union would find its own security enhanced and the cause of international peace would be immeasurably advanced.

### IV. THE TRUTH ABOUT HUNGARY

Mr. Chairman, no event of our times has more clearly illustrated the nature of these tensions than the uprising of the Hungarian people against their Soviet masters.

There is no need to recite here the history of Hungary, which is still fresh in the minds of all of us. The Special United Nations Committee on the Problem of Hungary has made an excellent beginning on its assignment in the report which it issued on February 21, which I commend to the attention of the members of this committee. It is enough for me to mention such highlights of the Hungarian story as have a bearing on the absurd Soviet charge that the United States instigated these tragic events.

I quote from a letter presented on February 4 to the Secretary General from Mr. Peter Mod, who signed himself permanent representative of Hungary to the United Nations. This letter was circulated as Document A/3521, February 5, and here is what it says about the calling in of Soviet forces to crush a patriotic outburst of Hungarian national feeling:

"The Hungarian Government exercised its sovereign rights and called for the assistance of Soviet troops stationed in Hungary under the Warsaw Defense Pact so as to avoid further bloodshed and disorder and to defend the democratic order and the peoples' power."

Mr. Chairman, I have three comments on this story.

First, if the Hungarian Government had to call for troops, it is strange that it did not call for the Hungarian Army, a sizable military force. It is clear throughout the years of Soviet rule over Hungary, the regime was unable to arm Hungarians to handle an anti-Soviet fight in Budapest.

Second, the allegation that Soviet troops intervened to avoid further bloodshed cannot be passed over without comment. In fact, the massive intervention by Soviet tanks to avoid further bloodshed brought death to an estimated 25,000 on the Hungarian side, as well as several thousand Russians.

Third, it is all very well for Mr. Mod on February 5 to tell us about the calling in of Soviet troops, but there is an earlier message to the United Nations which will not soon be forgotten here, and which I wish to quote at this point. It was a cablegram addressed on November 1 to the Secretary General, and signed by Imre Nagy, President of the Council of Ministers of the Hungarian People's Republic, designated Minister for Foreign Affairs. This telegram stated as follows:

"Reliable reports have reached the Government of the Hungarian People's Republic that further Soviet units are entering into Hungary. The President of the Council of Ministers in his capacity of Minister for Foreign Affairs summoned M. Andropov, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the Soviet Union to Hungary, and expressed his strongest protest against the entry of further Soviet troops into Hungary. He demanded the instant and immediate withdrawal of these Soviet forces. He informed the Soviet Ambassador that the Hungarian Government immediately repudiates the Warsaw Treaty and at the same time declares Hungary's neutrality, turns to the United Nations and requests the help of the four great powers in defending the country's neutrality. The Government of the Hungarian People's Republic made the declaration of neutrality on November 1, 1956. Therefore, I request Your Excellency promptly to put on the agenda of the forthcoming General Assembly of the United

Nations the question of Hungary's neutrality and the defense of this neutrality by the four great powers."

I come again to the Soviet charge that this resolution was instigated by the United States. Mr. Mod's letter appears to be the only attempt at a systematic summary of these specific charges that we have seen to date. Under the heading of "Facts That Have Come to Light," it names 5 Hungarians as spies and counterrevolutionaries, and it alleges that 1 of these had sent 20 others into Hungary—it quotes 2 broadcasts by Radio Free Europe advising the Freedom Fighters not to trust Imre Nagy—and it says that a 2-way radio and various small arms of German, Belgian, and American manufacture, were captured in one of the Freedom Fighters' strongholds.

Examine that letter as you will, Mr. Chairman, those are the only concrete details it contains to support the Soviet charge that the United States instigated the Hungarian revolution. We are being asked to believe that a foreign plot, resting on the work of some 2 dozen emigre agents, caused the population of Budapest to rise en masse, and that the resulting insurrection had to be crushed at the cost of 25,000 Hungarian lives. Clearly, we must look for the real origin of the events not outside Hungary, but inside—in years of brutal misrule by the servants of Moscow.

It is not necessary to go to so-called "capitalist" sources to find support for this statement. Here is part of an editorial from the Budapest newspaper, Szabad Nep, dated October 29, 1956:

"The latest issue of Pravda carries a dispatch from its own correspondent about the events in Hungary entitled 'Collapse of the Antipopular Adventure in Hungary.' This is an error. What happened in Budapest was neither antipopular nor an adventure. What is more, it did not collapse. For 5 days this city, torn by fate, shed blood and suffered. But through hundreds of deaths, the ideals of true patriotism and democracy were burning in the fires.

"The slogans of Socialist democracy were the loudest to be heard and not those of the reaction and counterrevolution. The revolutionary people of Buda and Pest want a people's freedom without tyranny, terror, and fear. They want more bread and national independence. Is this then an antipopular adventure?"

"What collapsed could indeed be called antipopular. It was the reign of the Rakosi-Gero clique."

"The Pravda article further states that manifestations of the people of Pest and the revolt were instigated by the subversive work of the British and American imperialists. We can safely say that all 1.5 million inhabitants of Budapest are deeply hurt and insulted by this assertion. In body or in spirit, a large portion of the population of Budapest was present at the demonstrations on Tuesday, October 23. They sympathized or agreed with the basic patriotic and democratic aims of the great popular uprising."

"The bloody, tragic, but at the same time ennobling fight, lasting 5 days, was not instigated by some sort of subversive work. It was caused, alas, by our own faults and crimes. The greatest of our faults and crimes was our failure to protect the sacred flame which our ancestors had bequeathed to us—our national independence."

And not only Budapest, Mr. Chairman, but Moscow, also began to admit the same truth, however reluctantly. On October 30 the Soviet Government issued a remarkable statement.

"The Soviet Government and all the Soviet people deeply regret that the development of events in Hungary has led to bloodshed. On the request of the Hungarian People's Government the Soviet Government con-

sented to the entry into Budapest of Soviet Army units to assist the Hungarian People's Army and the Hungarian authorities to establish order in the town. Believing that the further presence of Soviet Army units in Hungary can serve as a cause for even greater deterioration of the situation, the Soviet Government has given instructions to its military command to withdraw the Soviet Army units from Budapest as soon as this is recognized as necessary by the Hungarian Government."

Mr. Chairman, despite all the elliptical phrases in that Soviet Government statement, two things are noteworthy:

1. Not one word in the whole statement—which is much longer than the part just quoted—alleges outside instigation, by the United States or any other country. That line began to be played vigorously only after the Soviet Union had proceeded, through an act of classic perfidy, to crush the revolution and disperse the Nagy government.

2. On October 30, Moscow admitted in effect that its army was fighting against a genuine patriotic outburst. That is the only possible meaning of its admission that the further presence of Soviet Army units in Hungary can serve as a cause for even greater deterioration of the situation. The Soviet leaders can never unsay that admission.

October 30 was the high tide of Soviet candor. On November 2, after the Nagy government repudiated the Warsaw Pact, and declared neutrality for Hungary, hundreds of Soviet tanks descended on Budapest. Then Moscow began to tell a different story—that the United States had planned the mass uprising of the Hungarian people.

Mr. Chairman, to most of us here this Soviet argument is a mockery of the facts. We wonder how any man can present it with a straight face. We must remember, however, that the Soviet measure of truth consists solely of whatever advances the interests of the party and the regime.

#### V. CONCLUSION

There is much that we could propose in the way of Assembly action on this subject, and we would willingly make proposals if we thought that new and constructive resolutions at this time were likely to be a beneficial influence on Soviet policy. However, there is little reason to hope that that would be the case.

The General Assembly has adopted many resolutions pertinent to the problems raised here, most recently with regard to Hungary. The Soviet Union has always failed to observe them. The United States feels that this is not the time for the General Assembly to add new resolutions to what has already been so well expressed. As in so many cases, the need is for Soviet compliance.

Yet we do not despair. We look for the time when the Soviet Government will see fit to restore to the peoples of Eastern Europe their national freedom; to open up their borders to the fresh air of genuinely free interchange with all nations; and to concentrate on promoting the genuine safety and welfare and creative power of their own remarkable people. No event within the power of governments could be of greater benefit to world peace. Someday the Soviet Government must recognize that freedom in Eastern Europe is not incompatible with Soviet security.

If progress is to be made along this road, Mr. Chairman, it is the Soviet Union which must help itself. Today its leaders remain committed to a grim totalitarian philosophy of conflict which leads to suppression of human liberty, to battling all ideas differing from their own.

Mr. Chairman, I close with this word of hope. Long after the Soviet slanders we have heard today are forgotten, this General Assembly will be remembered for the devoted efforts made here in favor of a just peace. The settlements for which we strive are based

on the idea that disagreements between nations, no matter how stubborn, can be solved without war. The United States believes that the political warfare which Soviet Communist feels obligated to wage against the free world need not be an exception to that rule. It is of human origin, it is limited, and it will end. May the Soviet Union understand this fact, so that, with its prompt and indispensable help, we can begin to end the conflict peacefully, and in the justice and friendship for which humanity longs.

#### NOMINATION OF DAVID K. E. BRUCE TO BE AMBASSADOR TO WESTERN GERMANY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, one of the more unusual manifestations of partisanship has appeared in this morning's newspapers. It was carried in a story by the very careful and very responsible Associated Press correspondent, Jack Bell.

The story describes protests carried all the way to the White House by some of our colleagues against the nomination of David K. E. Bruce to be Ambassador to West Germany. The protests have an overtone that deserves careful consideration.

The protests do not claim that Mr. Bruce is unqualified by temperament, training, or inclination to fill this responsible post. They do not claim that he has taken any actions that would hamper his service to the United States.

Those who are doing the protesting base their anger on one point and one point only—that Mr. Bruce has allegedly contributed \$1,000 to 1956 Democratic campaign funds.

Mr. President, since when has this Nation operated on the theory that only Republicans can deal with diplomacy? Since when is the sole criterion of a man's ability to serve the use to which he puts his campaign checkbook?

The President of the United States has selected Mr. Bruce without regard to his partisan affiliations. Presumably, the President feels that his qualifications outweigh this factor.

A decision of that kind is one that most Americans would applaud. I do not believe that they would agree with the influential Republican Senator, who asked not to be quoted by name, but who said, according to Jack Bell:

Senate Republicans were angry at the appointment of a Democratic contributor to one of the choice posts as ambassador often given as a reward to those who have given financial support to the party in power.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Not at this time. I shall be glad to yield when I have concluded my statement.

Mr. President, I do not pose as an expert in the methods by which our Ambassadors are selected. But I think it is an outrage to assume that an ambassadorial post is nothing but a reward for faithful partisan service.

I would take that stand regardless of which party made the appointment.

Our Ambassador to Germany is a key figure in our foreign policy. The American people have only one question about the man who will fill the job—is he ca-

pable of representing the United States with ability and with loyalty in a post that is crucial to our future?

I do not recall that Mr. Bruce has ever been overly partisan. He has his convictions—but he has not denied others the right to their convictions.

His nomination will go to a committee which can determine his qualifications. There will be ample time for all the testimony that is needed as to his experience, his faithfulness and his capacity.

Once we have all the facts, we can make our decision. But it will be a sad day for the Senate if it is a political decision rather than a decision as to what course best serves our country.

I ask unanimous consent that Jack Bell's article be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as pertinent to my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRUCE CHOICE AS ENVOY IRKS GOP LEADERS—  
SENATORS REPORTED IN UPROAR OVER NAMING OF DEMOCRAT

(By Jack Bell)

President Eisenhower's appointment of a \$1,000 contributor to 1956 Democratic campaign funds as Ambassador to West Germany threw Senate Republicans into an uproar last night.

Overruling protests carried to the White House by some Republican leaders, Mr. Eisenhower sent to the Senate the nomination of David K. E. Bruce, 59, an Under Secretary of State and an Ambassador to France in the Truman administration.

Bruce, who replaces James B. Conant, was among three diplomatic assignments announced yesterday. The others were Amory Houghton, chairman of the board of the Corning (N. Y.) Glass Works, to replace C. Douglas Dillon as Ambassador to France, and William J. Sebald, a State Department career officer, who fills the vacancy caused by the death of Ambassador to Australia, Douglas Moffat.

Bruce was listed by a Senate elections subcommittee as having contributed \$1,000 to Democratic organizations in a report covering the period from January 1 to November 30, 1956.

Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, Republican, of Vermont, said his colleagues were incensed at the appointment of another Democratic campaign contributor to an important diplomatic post.

"That eliminates any ardor we Senate Republicans might otherwise have to defend the administration from the attacks the Democrats are making on it," he declared.

"They ask us to defend Secretary John Foster Dulles and the President when they are criticized by the Democrats," AIKEN said. "But every time there is an important job to be filled—they give it to a Democrat."

AIKEN, a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, said it was too early to say whether there would be any organized effort to block confirmation of Bruce's appointment.

Bruce is the son of the late Senator William C. Bruce, a Maryland Democrat, and formerly he was married to a daughter of the late Andrew Mellon, Secretary of the Treasury in three Republican administrations.

There was no immediate Senate reaction to Mr. Eisenhower's appointment of Houghton. Corning Glass has been involved in 1 criminal and 5 civil antitrust actions brought by the Government since 1939.

James C. Hagerty, White House press secretary, was asked whether the President was aware of the antitrust cases against Corning and whether the White House had



any comment on why Houghton resigned from the War Production Board in 1942.

"I have no comment," Hagerty said, "although before an Ambassador is appointed he has a complete check made on him."

#### PROTESTS OVERRULED

An influential Republican Senator, who asked not to be quoted by name, said Senate Republicans were angry at the appointment of a Democratic contributor to one of the choice posts as Ambassador often given as a reward to those who have given financial support to the party in power.

This Senator said protests had been made more than 2 weeks ago to Meade Alcorn, Republican national chairman against the appointment. He described Alcorn as disturbed by the prospective appointment. Alcorn was reported on his way to Washington from his home in Hartford, Conn., and could not be reached.

The Republican Senator said direct protests against the appointment had been made to Sherman Adams, Mr. Eisenhower's chief assistant. But he said Adams had overruled these objections.

Senator JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER, Republican, of Maryland, said he was disappointed at the President's action in nominating Bruce but would not oppose confirmation.

"I don't think it's a good practice to appoint Democrats to these jobs when there are plenty of Republicans capable of filling them," BUTLER said.

[Senator FRANCIS CASE (Republican, of South Dakota) said that the "mere fact that he (Bruce) happened to be a Democrat wouldn't disqualify him in my opinion."

"I think the Foreign Relations Committee would want to inquire into the cause of his (Bruce's) espousal of the Stevenson candidacy in relation to the Eisenhower foreign policy and the position of West Germany in the European picture," CASE said.]

Over the last 16 years, Houghton has had several Government jobs. He served as Assistant Deputy Director of the Materials Division, Office of Production Management, in 1941-42, and later in 1942 he was Deputy Chief of the War Production Board's Bureau of Industry Branches. In 1943-44 he was chief mission officer for the Lend-Lease Administration.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. BUTLER. It is very unlike the very able and distinguished majority leader to regard all objections to this appointment as being in the same category. If he will read the article carefully he will find that I made no objection to the qualifications of Mr. Bruce; as a matter of fact, I said I thought he was qualified. Likewise I made no mention of political contributions.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have not charged the distinguished Senator from Maryland with anything.

Mr. BUTLER. But I happen to be one of the Senators mentioned in the article, and I have a right to say on the floor that I made no objection to this nomination. I stated publicly that I had no objection. I could not complain of Mr. Bruce's qualifications. I did not wish to play politics with his nomination. I said and now repeat that there are plenty of qualified Republicans from whom to choose an ambassador and that we do not have to go outside our party to find one. There is nothing evil in Mr. Bruce's appointment, but I say it is better practice at this juncture to choose a Republican.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wish to associate myself with the distinguished majority leader, and to state that on the basis of personal knowledge, in my opinion David Bruce is one of the best qualified men this country can produce for any post in the diplomatic service, regardless of party.

I recall full well that under Democratic administrations Republican Ambassadors have been appointed. I recall a former colleague of ours, Warren Austin, who was appointed as the first Ambassador to the United Nations. He was a Republican in good standing.

I recall our late colleague Dwight Griswold, a Senator from Nebraska, who was appointed head of the Economic Mission to Greece with the rank of Ambassador.

I recall John McCloy, who was a Republican, and who was appointed High Commissioner to Germany. A High Commissioner is the same as an Ambassador. All of these men were of exceptional ability and all of them served our country well.

I think the President of the United States and Mr. Dulles are to be commended for showing the good judgment they have displayed in selecting a man with the qualifications and the capabilities of David Bruce. He is an honor, an asset to this country, a man of real value, and we need him now.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the statement which my friend from Montana has made.

I have made no charges against my friend from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER]. I merely said that I hoped that we had not come to the point where we operate on the theory that only Republicans will be called to work in the foreign policy field.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to my friend from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, when I read the newspaper this morning, I was very unhappy to see David Bruce's appointment headed for political controversy.

I was personally unhappy, because I have known Mr. Bruce for, I think, about 30 years, and I have watched his record and his interest in our national affairs, which I think have been admirable at all times. I believe he has become one of the most effective men we have seen in the State Department in a good many years.

I should like at this point to make a further statement. I had not realized that the majority leader was going to raise this issue.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I will say to the Senator from Connecticut that the majority leader did not raise the issue. The issue was raised by the article written by Mr. Bell.

Mr. BUSH. I understand that. I had hoped that the matter would not boil up, so to speak, as it appears to have done.

Mr. Bruce has had considerable experience in the Western European area.

As early as 1926 he served as a Foreign Service vice consul in Rome. He returned to Great Britain as chief representative of the American Red Cross in 1940, and from that date until 1954 he was continuously associated with the activities in Western Europe except for a brief period when he served as Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

In 1953, in keeping with the principle of bipartisanship in foreign affairs, Mr. Bruce was appointed United States observer to the Interim Committee of the European Defense Community and special American representative to European High Authority for Coal and Steel. Both of these positions carried a considerable amount of responsibility, were extremely important to United States foreign affairs, and required the utmost in diplomacy. Mr. Bruce served in this capacity at the request of the President. Quoted below is an excerpt from a White House press release of February 18, 1953:

In view of the importance which the United States attaches to the progress being made in Europe toward developing a unified six-nation community, the President has asked Mr. David K. E. Bruce, former Under Secretary of State, to serve as United States observer to the Interim Committee of the European Defense Community and special American representative to the European High Authority for Coal and Steel.

The position of Ambassador to Germany is today one of our most sensitive positions, and requires a man of unique background and the qualifications which Mr. Bruce possesses. And again, in keeping with the principle of bipartisanship, Mr. Bruce was considered the best qualified man for the position.

Mr. President, at this point in my remarks I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement which will give background information on Mr. David K. Bruce.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON DAVID BRUCE

1921: Admitted to the Maryland bar.

1921-25: Practiced in Baltimore.

1926-28: Vice consul, United States Foreign Service, Rome.

1928-40: Engaged privately in business and farming.

1940: Chief representative in Great Britain for the American Red Cross.

1941-45: With OSS (1943-45, Director of European theater OSS).

1947-48: Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

1948-49: Chief of ECA mission to France.

1949-52: United States Ambassador to France.

1952-53: Under Secretary of State.

1953: Appointed special United States observer at Interim Committee of the European Defense Community.

1953-54: Special American representative to European High Authority for Coal and Steel.

#### MISCELLANEOUS

1924-26: Member of the Maryland House of Delegates.

1939-42: Member of the Virginia House of Delegates.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, Mr. Bruce is a Democrat. He was a member of the Maryland House of Delegates for 2 years, 1924 to 1926. He was also a member of the Virginia House of Delegates from 1939 to 1942.

In 1953, as a member of the Randall Commission, I was in Paris, and we held hearings there. We heard American Ambassadors assigned to different countries of Europe testify. I believe the members of our commission agreed that Mr. Bruce's testimony was the clearest, the best, and the most effective given to our commission by anyone representing the United States.

So I hope, Mr. President, that this nomination will be considered on its merits. We know that during the Truman administration numerous Republicans were appointed to high office.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement of examples of prominent Republicans who served during the administrations of President Franklin D. Roosevelt and President Harry S. Truman.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The following are examples of prominent Republicans who served during the administrations of Roosevelt and Truman:

Secretary of Navy Knox.

Secretary of War Stimson.

John Foster Dulles, who served as adviser to Secretary Acheson on the Japanese treaty.

Warren Austin, first United States Ambassador to the United Nations.

Robert Lovett, Under Secretary of State, Secretary of Defense.

John J. McCloy, United States High Commissioner to Germany.

Paul Nitze, head of the policy planning staff, Department of State.

Dwight Griswold, chief of United States aid mission to Greece.

Milton Eisenhower, representative of the United States to 3d session of UNESCO.

Paul G. Hoffman, Administrator for Economic Cooperation.

Dwight D. Eisenhower, recalled from retirement at Columbia University to serve as commander in chief, NATO.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I shall supply additional names later.

Mr. BUSH. I wish to thank the majority leader for the courtesy he has shown me.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I deeply appreciate the statement which the Senator from Connecticut has made.

I shall be glad to yield to all Senators to express themselves on the subject.

I have not known Mr. Bruce as long as has the Senator from Connecticut. I do not know Mr. Bruce as either a Democrat or a Republican, but I believe him to be a patriotic American.

I believe also that the Committee on Foreign Relations will hold hearings and take testimony to determine whether Mr. Bruce is qualified for the post to which he has been appointed. I shall await the action of the committee and the recommendations it may make to the Senate.

The only point which the Senator from Texas desired to make was that he hoped we have not reached the point in the Senate where it is felt that only Republicans are qualified to hold diplomatic positions.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to my friend, the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. First, I thank the majority leader, the distinguished Senator from Texas, for bringing forth from our colleagues these testimonials in behalf of Mr. David Bruce. They are testimonials which are surely merited.

I also wish to thank the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] for his very able and accurate statement relating to Mr. Bruce.

Then I should like to add, in connection with the list which the Senator from Texas has mentioned, that only recently the Committee on Foreign Relations reported favorably the nomination of Mr. Zellerbach to be Ambassador to Italy. Mr. Zellerbach formerly was Chief of the ECA mission in the Truman administration. He served then with the rank of Ambassador, and now he has been named by this administration to be Ambassador to Italy.

A former Ambassador to the United Kingdom, a position which is the chief, choice, top ambassadorial post, was Mr. Gifford, a Republican, who served in the Truman administration. The Ambassadorship to Great Britain is one of the most important ambassadorial posts, if not the most important, in the gift of this Nation.

Mr. Eric Johnston, a Republican, served the Truman administration ably, loyally, and patriotically. He was selected because of his competence rather than because of his political persuasion.

It appears to me that although undoubtedly there are many Republicans who are capable of filling ambassadorial posts, the criteria should be the skill, the ability, and the knowledge of those who are called upon to fill the posts; their politics should be a secondary consideration.

In Mr. Bruce, the administration has selected a man who was Under Secretary of State, and is keenly aware of the problems which face this country and the world. He served in France during the time when the relationships between France and Germany were of a most critical and crucial nature. His assignment now to one of the most important diplomatic posts is certainly in line with his previous experience. I, for one, not knowing Mr. Bruce personally, except in a casual way, but knowing him chiefly because of his splendid service record, feel that the President is to be commended for making this appointment.

I urge the President to reach deep into the talent of this Nation for further such assignments. It is a national shame that great talents, skill, and ability, which are so sorely needed at this terrible hour in our Nation's history, are being lost to the Government while they cruise around the world, so to speak, on a private basis. The Government needs the best assistance it can get.

There are men of the stature of the former Senator from Connecticut, Mr. Benton, and Mr. Chester Bowles, and also, to mention him again, John McCloy, who are needed for the service of this Government, rather than in private industry or in the writing of articles. They are desperately needed to bring our

Nation peace and security, and to give us better faith and better image in the world in which we live.

I hope the President will make more such appointments.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I appreciate the comments of my friend from Minnesota. I thoroughly subscribe to the sentiments which he has expressed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I rise to make a brief comment on the colloquy concerning the nomination of Mr. David Bruce to be Ambassador to West Germany. I think it has been generally realized, both during this administration and in the previous one, that it was important in the field of our foreign policy to have bipartisan representation and support. It is perfectly obvious to every observer, both within the Senate and without, that with the parties so closely divided as they are, and with the Democratic Party holding the control of both this body and the body on the other side of the Capitol, if our Government is to function as the Government of the United States, and not as two warring coequal branches of the Government, it is necessary that there be cooperation.

I have commended Senators on the other side of the aisle on various occasions throughout the first 4 years of this administration for having supported administration proposals on a basis which placed the country above any narrow partisanship. I think it is entirely proper that from time to time Members of the other party be selected, just as it has been pointed out that during the 20 years of Democratic administrations many Republicans were appointed to office.

I hope my friends on the other side of the aisle will not become overanxious, because I think by the time we Republicans have been in power for 20 years, our list will equal in size their list. But that does not necessarily have to be done in the first 5 years.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I want the record to show that I do not share the Senator's optimism. [Laughter.]

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think it is entirely proper, as the President of the United States and the Secretary of State have felt it is, to have the nomination of Mr. Bruce submitted to the Senate. Based on the information I have concerning the caliber, character, and background of Mr. Bruce, I should imagine, without trying to prejudge what the Committee on Foreign Relations will do, that the nomination will probably be reported favorably to the Senate by a substantial majority; and after due discussion, the nomination probably will be confirmed by the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am grateful for the comments which the distinguished minority leader has made. The contribution which he has made to the discussion is the type of statement which I would expect to come from BILL KNOWLAND.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.



Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank the distinguished majority leader for his statement. The junior Senator from Arizona merely wishes to make the observation that he does not desire to enter the colloquy about the merits or demerits of Democrats for appointment to foreign posts or for other political assignments.

The distinguished majority leader read a list of Republicans who had served under the Democrats, and while the junior Senator from Arizona is perfectly willing to accept almost all of those names unequivocally, and a few of them with some reservations, I suggest that, in my book, Paul Hoffman does not fulfill the requirements of being a Republican.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Arizona and Mr. Hoffman can debate that matter between themselves. I never become involved in such discussions.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I simply wanted to remind the Senator from Texas that Collier's is no longer in business.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I was not aware of the Bruce controversy until this morning. Frankly, I was deeply shocked to hear of the story that was reported in the newspapers.

I have known Mr. David Bruce for a considerable time. I was very closely associated with him in his operations abroad during the days when this Nation was trying to develop the Marshall plan and similar operations in Europe.

I feel that his appointment constitutes one of the finest appointments this administration has made. He is a man eminently well qualified and trained for the post. He has been living with the western European situation practically since the close of World War II. It never occurred to me to question whether he was a Democrat or a Republican. I agree with the distinguished majority leader completely on that score.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I never have entertained any doubt about my able and scholarly friend from New Jersey associating himself with the theory that Ambassadors should come from only one party. The senior Senator from New Jersey is not that partisan.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, We are having a very important discussion. I am in favor of more appointments from the Republican Party, but certainly in the field of diplomacy or foreign relations, we must try to pick the best Americans available.

I know from personal experience that David Bruce is one of the outstanding and one of the best-informed Americans of today; and from my experience on the Foreign Relations Committee, I have felt that he is one of the most intelligent Americans we have had serving us abroad, where he has reported accurately and faithfully the existing conditions.

I wish to state that I do not believe politics should enter into our consideration of nominations to ambassadorships.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to my delightful friend, the Senator from

California, if he wishes to take part in this discussion.

Mr. KUCHEL. I do; and I thank the Senator from Texas for yielding to me.

I wish to state that I very much regret that the article to which reference has been made, written by a distinguished newspaperman, has caused my friend, the majority leader, some concern and, beyond that, has provoked the long colloquy which has occurred here.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I wish to point out to my friend that not only has it caused the majority leader some concern, but it has caused others some concern. When we reach the point where protests are made to the White House because an ambassadorial appointee may have supported one party or contributed to one party, we come to a sad day in America.

Mr. KUCHEL. I wish to attempt to allay a little of the apprehension which apparently the newspaper article has caused.

Mr. President, I do not doubt that in the past 25 years, political considerations have—perhaps unfortunately, perhaps not—sometimes motivated national administrations in making appointments to specific positions. But in the present instance I am glad to say that, like the Senator from Texas, I want the person nominated to serve our Nation as Ambassador to West Germany to be judged on his merits, and on his merits alone.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I welcome the Senator from California to the fold; I am always delighted to be associated with him, and I am glad that he feels that the standard of merit should control in the making of appointments.

Mr. KUCHEL. However, with all due respect, I suggest to my friend, the Senator from Texas, the relevancy of the Good Book:

Judge not, that ye be not judged.

For with what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged; and with what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again.

And why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother's eye, but considerest not the beam that is in thine own eye?

I suggest that the Republican Party and the Democratic Party equally have within them great men of the Nation, and equally have within them men who are motivated by politics and by political considerations and by nothing else.

Good appointments and bad appointments have been, and will be, made by any and every administration. Neither holding public office, nor party labels, are any guaranty of ability.

In this instance a Republican administration has seen fit to designate one who apparently is an able American citizen, registered in the Democratic Party, to participate in the nonpartisan foreign policy of the Government of the United States. The Senate will now await the recommendations of the Foreign Relations Committee. Then we here will make our judgment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I appreciate the statement the Senator from California has made. Evidently he did not hear my statement when I said that I would take the stand that I have taken today in the Senate

regardless of which party made the appointment.

Mr. KUCHEL. I am sure my friend would do so.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, referring to the colloquy regarding the nomination of Mr. Bruce to be Ambassador of the United States to West Germany, may I say that I think the apprehension of the distinguished majority leader may be exaggerated. However, I do not wish to address myself to that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield at this point?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I deplore the fact that the Senator from Kentucky feels that I exaggerated any apprehension. I merely quoted from an article quoting certain Republican Senators. I said—as I have stated many times in the past, when Democratic administrations have named Republicans to ambassadorial posts—that I did not think partisan affiliations should be the sole qualification for appointment to diplomatic posts.

Mr. COOPER. I understood perfectly the statement made by the Senator from Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I would not want my friend, the Senator from Kentucky, to think that I exaggerated anything.

Mr. COOPER. I only say that I think the Senator has exaggerated the political significance of the newspaper report.

However, I wish to address myself to the appointment itself.

Because of the positions Mr. Bruce has held, and with distinction—as our Ambassador to France, and in other positions connected with NATO and ECA—I am sure that his background of experience will be very valuable in the position of Ambassador to West Germany, for which he has been nominated.

The relationships of France and Germany are important, as they have always been. Mr. Bruce understands these relationships and he has played an important part in the development of our relationship with our European allies. I am happy the President has nominated him. I have no doubt, and I am sure the distinguished majority leader has no doubt at all, that his nomination will be confirmed by the Senate. While consideration of the appointment by the Foreign Relations Committee is required, I have no doubt of the confirmation of Mr. Bruce's nomination, nor of the great abilities he will bring to the post.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I express the hope that my good friend from Kentucky will carefully read the statement of the majority leader, which will appear in the RECORD tomorrow morning, and then draw his own conclusions.

Mr. MONRONEY subsequently said: Mr. President, I wish to compliment the distinguished majority leader for raising the question whether political membership in one party should deny to a proven able diplomat the right to serve his country. Certainly if the State Department thought Mr. Bruce could properly fill the toughest diplomatic position today, that of being Ambassador to West Germany,

and selected him for that purpose, he was selected not because of his membership in a particular political party, but despite his membership in it. He was selected because throughout the years, when he was tested by the State Department in various diplomatic posts, where decisions had to be made, Mr. Bruce met the tests.

In meeting the challenge which appeared in the form of complaints to the White House, I feel the distinguished majority leader has raised a most important point, and one which should prevent future attacks on individuals and attempts to blackball their appointments simply because they are not members of the party of the President who happens to be in power.

Mr. JAVITS subsequently said: Mr. President, I should like to identify myself with Senators who spoke earlier expressing confidence in David Bruce as our prospective Ambassador to the Republic of West Germany.

I have known Mr. Bruce for a long time, and have great confidence in him. I may observe that it is the essence of bipartisanship when the best from both parties are picked for important appointments.

Perhaps the majority leader looks for too much when he expects every member of both parties to be convinced that bipartisanship is best. We can hardly expect that in our country. We have seen today some of the differences which exist. The expression of views on both sides has been helpful. It has shown what I think is true; namely, that the great majority of opinion supports bipartisanship, including appointments to high office.

#### SCHEDULED ADDRESSES BY THE PREMIER OF FRANCE AND THE PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF WEST GERMANY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have an announcement to make concerning the program for the Senate. As previously announced, the Premier of France, Guy Mollet, will address the Senate tomorrow at 3:30 p. m.

I had earlier advised the Senate that a joint meeting of the House and Senate had been arranged for March 7 to hear an address to be delivered by the President of the Republic of West Germany, Adolph Huess. Unfortunately, President Huess is ill, and has postponed his visit to the United States. I am sure that at a later date similar arrangements will be made, and the Senate will be advised.

#### INCREASE OF THE INTEREST RATE ON GI MORTGAGES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it was with great satisfaction that I noted that the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs firmly rejected, last week, the administration's proposal to raise the interest rate on GI home mortgages from 4½ percent to 5 percent, and, instead, proposed to the House a bill similar to my own bill, S. 88, which would provide substantial funds derived from the na-

tional service life insurance revolving fund to purchase GI mortgages at par.

It is typical of this administration to take the sterile line that the only way out of the current home mortgage problem is to raise the interest rate.

Mr. President, this administration seems to have only two answers to the great economic problems of this Nation. One is to lower price supports on agricultural commodities wherever possible, and the other is to raise the interest rates wherever possible. The result is that the farmer is desperately trying to keep his farm together, the construction worker and the whole construction industry are slipping frantically into a truly desperate situation, and veteran home buyers are unable to find financing; and, on the other hand, the great financial houses of the country are enjoying unprecedented profits.

A recent issue of the St. Paul Pioneer Press carried an article, written by Mr. Relman Morin of the Associated Press, entitled "Tight Money: High Loan Rates Drag on Housing." I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD this article from the February 20, 1957, issue of the St. Paul Pioneer Press.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### TIGHT MONEY: HIGH LOAN RATES DRAG ON HOUSING

(By Relman Morin)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Tight money is not a mysterious condition confined solely to banks, bond houses, or Wall Street. It touches the blueprints of the home you may be planning or the house you want to buy. In this third article of a series on the Nation's economy Relman Morin, AP staff writer, shows how it has affected the home building industry and the people in industries affected by building.)

Most Americans want to own their own home today, and most of them do. Of all the astonishing changes of the last 25 years, this is one of the most spectacular. Today nearly 60 percent of America's 43 million families live in their own homes. Before World War II the figure was nearer 40 percent, and there were fewer families.

Well, wedding bells ring for 1½ million couples a year now, and young people don't wait, as their parents had to wait, to accumulate so much cash for the down payment on a house.

Babies arrive—over 4 million a year at the latest count—and they tend to set people thinking of a home with a backyard.

Government help on financing spurred these urges.

Thus the home-building industry has become a gigantic segment of the Nation's economy. Every year since 1948 it has erected a million or more dwelling units. Into them went mountains of wood, glass, metal, bricks, concrete, plaster, and plastics—quickly followed by other mountains of furniture, rugs, household appliances, textiles.

Estimates say 1 out of every 15 wage earners (not counting those on farms) owes his livelihood today to home building.

So this is big business, involving millions of people. And right now it is a wide-screen headache for many of them.

A builder here is angry, a would-be buyer there frustrated. Congress is examining problems of both. The Federal managers of money have come under hot fire.

#### LOAN PROBLEMS

Home building dropped off in 1956. It went down from the 1,300,000 units of 1955 to

1,100,000. Some estimates, but by no means all, are that it will drop again this year.

Looking at 1956, analysts saw a sharp reduction in total GI home-loan applications to the Veterans' Administration. Did that mean fewer ex-GI's are trying to buy homes?

"No," said the builders. "It's money." They pointed out that GI applications are not accepted by the VA until lenders have agreed to put up the money for the proposed purchase.

Tight money has brought a rise in interest rates on loans. The VA rate is 4½ percent. It is 5 percent for the Federal Housing Administration. Investigators found they could do better elsewhere than on these mortgages.

Allied with the drop in GI applications was another aspect.

Requests from builders to the VA to appraise the value of homes to be made available for GI loans also fell off sharply.

That could mean more builders plan to concentrate on putting up higher priced dwellings. Along with interest rates, the cost of land, labor, and materials have risen.

But George Sullivan Goodyear, president of the National Association of Home Builders (NAHB)—himself a builder—said tight money was the chief item in the headache.

"The cost of money has gone up more than any other single item in the cost of a house," he said. "It has forced us to price ourselves out of the market."

Late last year, the NAHB questioned 800 contractors across the country on the situation and the outlook for this year. Some findings—

1. Most thought money would remain tight, and many expect it to get tighter.

2. Median prices on homes were expected to rise from \$14,700 last year to \$15,200 this year.

3. A majority reported that they, personally, expect to do as well or better in 1957 as last year. But nearly 70 percent predicted a nationwide drop in home building.

"Uncertainty . . . is the dominant note," said the NAHB, summarizing the outlook for 1957.

To see the picture at a closer range, take an individual case.

Samuel Block is a contractor in Detroit suburbs. He has been building 7 years. No specialist, he put up different types of homes, ranging from \$7,000 to \$30,000 in price.

"I've got 12 VA-type homes standing empty," he said. "Every time I sell one, I lose close to \$500. I would have been better off just to hold the land."

#### EARLY DAYS IN MONTANA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, steamboat travel on the rivers in Montana is rather remote, and a point of history; but in Montana there is one lady who has a vivid memory of days when steamboat travel on the Missouri River was an accepted mode of transportation. Mrs. Jessie Robertson, when 11 years old, came up the Missouri River by steamboat with her mother. She has lived in the Great Falls-Sun River area for 81 years.

Mrs. Robertson is very alert at 92, and can relate many interesting incidents in the transformation of Montana Territory into the great Treasure State.

A feature story in the February 12, 1957, issue of the Great Falls Tribune contains a number of Mrs. Robertson's recollections of her earlier years in Montana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled "Great Falls Woman, 92, Recalls Early Days at Sun River," be printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.



There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**SHE CAME UP THE MISSOURI RIVER BY STEAM-BOAT—GREAT FALLS WOMAN, 92, RECALLS EARLY DAYS AT SUN RIVER**

(By Tribune staff writer)

Montana residents in this year of 1957 who can remember steamboat days on the Missouri River are, in the nature of things, extremely few. One Great Falls resident who has such memories is Mrs. Jessie Robertson, who lives at the Elmore Apartments, each winter, and in an historic brick house at Sun River town each summer.

She is Mrs. Jessie Robertson, who at the age of 11 came up the Missouri River by steamboat with her mother, and who has lived in the Great Falls-Sun River area for 81 years.

It was in June 1876—the month of the Battle of the Little Big Horn—that Jessie and her mother, Mrs. John Vorus, boarded the steamboat *General Meade* at Sioux City, Iowa, for the trip to Fort Benton. Jessie's father, a Civil War veteran, was hospitalized at the Soldiers' Home in Milwaukee because of disabilities resulting from war service. Mrs. Vorus and daughter were en route to Montana Territory to make their home with Mrs. Vorus' father, James Strong, who had a ranch near Sun River town.

The Strong ranch was a mile and a quarter from the town, near the James Adams place. On arrival at Fort Benton, Mrs. Vorus and Jessie boarded a stagecoach for the final leg of their journey.

Today, Mrs. Robertson's memory, sight, and hearing are excellent. She observed her 92d birthday January 19.

What does she recall of the trip up the Missouri?

"I recall that among our fellow passengers was a brother of Nick Kessler, Helena pioneer, and his three daughters," Mrs. Robertson said. "The girls' mother had died, and their father was taking them to Helena to make their home. The Kessler girls' names were Louisa, Mary and Emma."

At one point on the river where the steamboat halted to take on wood, Indians came aboard.

"They wanted to buy the second Kessler girl and me," Mrs. Robertson said. "They offered 20 ponies for her and 10 ponies for me. I don't think they were joking, either."

Every time the boat stopped to take on wood, Jessie and the Kessler girls would go ashore to play. At one point, some of the men took rope and put up a swing to amuse the young passengers during the stopover.

The up-river trip from Sioux City to Fort Benton took 4 weeks.

Jessie Vorus attended the old Sun River School, later going to Helena to study at a Catholic convent. At the age of 18, she married B. A. Robertson, who worked at the George Steell store in Sun River. Robertson died at Havre in 1933.

Mrs. Robertson now maintains the former Steell home as a summer residence. Steell, long a leading citizen of Sun River, later became agent for the Blackfeet Indians and still later was a pioneer resident of the Flathead North Fork area, at Polebridge.

She recalls the days when troops were stationed at Fort Shaw.

"I remember riding horseback from Sun River to Fort Shaw with a girl friend, and seeing the soldiers at target practice. We rode side-saddle, of course; it was considered quite improper for girls and young women to ride in any other fashion in those days."

"What did we do for recreation besides riding? Well there was a dance almost every Friday night in the hall above the Sun River store. Usually we danced all night and would go to the hotel for breakfast. I remember that when Negro troops were stationed at Fort Shaw, an excellent orchestra

from the post, conducted by a tall Negro named Whittaker, supplied the music."

Mrs. Robertson also recalls the lynching of a Negro soldier at Sun River, following a shooting affray there. This was only a short time before the Army post was deactivated and the troops removed forever.

"Sun River residents were apprehensive about this lynching," Mrs. Robertson recalls. "They were afraid of a reprisal by the soldiers, but nothing of the kind occurred."

"Negro soldiers at Fort Shaw were not allowed to have their wives and families on the post, and some of them maintained their families in Sun River. Normally, relations between the townspeople and the soldiers were friendly."

Did the soldiers from Fort Shaw visit Sun River much during their leisure hours? Not much, Mrs. Robertson said. The Negro troops appeared to frequent the neighboring town more than the white troops which had preceded them, possibly because of the ban on Negro families at Fort Shaw.

Mrs. Robertson knew Will Hanks, editor of the Sun River Sun, very well. Hanks subsequently moved his printshop to Great Falls and established the Great Falls Tribune.

Other pioneers of the valley she recalls were Robert Vaughn, for whom the town of Vaughn was named; the Dunn brothers, Matt and Tom; John Largent, Robert S. Ford, father of Lee M. Ford, chairman of the board of the Great Falls National Bank, who still lives in the paternal home near Sun River; John Healy, and, of course, James Adams, who was her uncle.

Mrs. Robertson's mother died at the age of 102, at Billings, and is buried at Sun River, as are her grandparents, Mr. and Mrs. James Strong.

The Robertsons had 5 children—2 sons and 3 daughters. Only the daughters survive. They are Mrs. Norma Ketchum, Ephrata, Wash.; Ruth Robertson, Puyallup, Wash., and Mrs. Dorothy Davies, Missoula.

Mrs. Robertson has 10 grandchildren, and 9 great-grandchildren. Mrs. Fred Traber, 1512½ First Avenue South, is a granddaughter.

### THE NATIONAL DEBT

**Mr. O'MAHONEY.** Mr. President, I read in yesterday morning's issue of the New York Times a most interesting list of the public obligations of the United States which must be paid in the next 12 months. The brief article to which I refer is headed "One-Year Maturities Are \$75,770,817,783."

It reads:

Direct obligations of the United States Government in the hands of the public that will mature within 12 months amount to \$75,770,817,783. They consist of Treasury bonds, certificates of indebtedness, bills, and notes as follows:

I shall not read the entire list, but I point out that this list, as published yesterday, shows obligations almost \$200 million greater than the list published a week ago; that it is more than \$6 billion greater than the maturities which were coming up a year ago.

I have been making it a practice, Mr. President, to call the attention of the Senate and of those who read the RECORD to the enormous debt of the United States. These figures in the article published in the New York Times, which occupy less than 4 inches of space, tell us that the obligations which we must pay during the next 12 months are greater than was the entire national debt before we entered World War II. The

debt has been steadily increasing, and, more important than that, the interest upon the national debt has been increasing during the last 4 years.

Beginning with 1953, it has been the policy of the Treasury Department to raise the interest on the national debt. The budget which the President sent to Congress last January for the fiscal year 1958 calls for \$100 million more to pay the interest upon the national debt than during the previous fiscal year. The interest upon the national debt has been steadily increasing, until now it amounts to about \$7,500,000,000. The \$7,500,000,000 which we now will have to pay to the holders of the obligations of the Treasury is more than the cost for the operation of Congress, for the operation of the courts, and for the operation of all the other normal activities of government.

Only back in 1939 and 1940, before we became involved in World War II, the total appropriations made by the Congress of the United States for all purposes was scarcely more than \$10½ billion. It is important to bear this in mind when we are considering resolutions such as that which will presently be before the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that the clipping to which I have referred may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the clipping was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### ONE-YEAR MATURITIES ARE \$75,770,817,783

Direct obligations of the United States Government in the hands of the public that will mature within 12 months amount to \$75,770,817,783. They consist of Treasury bonds, certificates of indebtedness, bills, and notes as follows:

Date	Bonds, etc.	Amount
Feb. 25	Discount bills.....	\$1,600,093,000
Mar. 1	Series E savings bonds.....	2,221,561,610
1	Series F savings bonds.....	439,668,849
1	Series G savings bonds.....	1,576,728,600
7	Discount bills.....	1,600,005,000
14	do.....	1,599,968,000
15	2½-percent Treasury notes.....	575,000,000
21	Discount bills.....	1,600,310,000
22	2½-percent tax anticipation certificates.....	3,220,612,000
22	Tax anticipation bills.....	1,005,647,000
28	Discount bills.....	1,614,593,000
Apr. 1	1½-percent Treasury notes.....	9,000,000
4	Discount bills.....	1,599,988,000
11	do.....	1,600,455,000
18	do.....	1,600,483,000
25	do.....	1,600,512,000
May 2	do.....	1,700,238,000
9	do.....	1,700,188,000
15	1½-percent Treasury notes.....	4,154,930,000
16	Discount bills.....	1,700,438,000
23	do.....	1,800,319,000
June 24	Tax anticipation bills.....	3,351,464,000
24	3½-percent tax anticipation certificates.....	1,311,980,000
Aug 1	2½-percent Treasury notes.....	12,056,091,000
15	2-percent Treasury notes.....	3,792,028,000
Oct. 1	1½-percent Treasury notes.....	824,196,000
1	3½-percent certificates of indebtedness.....	7,270,942,000
1958		
Jan. 1	Series E savings bonds.....	2,343,258,752
1	Series F savings bonds.....	210,232,572
1	Series G savings bonds.....	1,667,867,400
Feb. 14	3½-percent certificates of indebtedness.....	8,422,000,000
	Total.....	75,770,817,783
	Week ago.....	75,584,325,783
	Year ago.....	69,490,985,203

<sup>1</sup> Maturing monthly within a year from this date forward.

# PROMOTION OF PEACE AND STABILITY IN THE MIDDLE EAST

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BLAKLEY in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 19) to authorize the President to undertake economic and military cooperation with nations in the general area of the Middle East in order to assist in the strengthening and defense of their independence.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Barrett	Holland	Neuberger
Bible	Humphrey	O'Mahoney
Blakeley	Javits	Saltonstall
Carroll	Johnson, Tex.	Stennis
Ervin	Long	Thurmond
Gore	Mansfield	Watkins
Hayden	McClellan	
Hennings	Morse	

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Senator from Oregon whether he wishes the quorum call continued? I am addressing the junior Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No debate is in order at this time.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MORSE. I object. If we are going to have the practice of holding Members to a quorum call, it cannot be had only for the convenience of the leadership of the Senate, but will have to be had—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No debate is in order. Objection is heard. A quorum is not present. The clerk will call the names of the absent Senators.

The legislative clerk called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. AIKEN, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. BUSH, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. BYRD, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. CLARK, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COTTON, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. FREAR, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HILL, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. IVES, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. JENNER, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KERR, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. LAUSCHE, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MARTIN of Iowa, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. McNAMARA, Mr. MONROE, Mr. MORTON, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. POTTER, Mr. PURTELL, Mr. REVERCOMB, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. SCHOEPPLE, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SMATHERS,

Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. TALMADGE, Mr. THYE, Mr. WILEY, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. YOUNG answered to their names when called.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

## DISQUALIFICATIONS OF JOHN FOSTER DULLES TO BE SECRETARY OF STATE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to address a few remarks to the question of the qualifications of the Secretary of State to perform the duties of his very important position in this hour of great crisis in American foreign policy. I base my remarks on an interesting article entitled "John Foster Dulles: A Very Complicated Man," written by Joseph C. Harsch, and published in Harper's magazine. The article reads, in part, as follows:

John Foster Dulles' father was a Presbyterian clergyman, dally and earnestly concerned with righteousness and duty. Both his maternal grandfather, John W. Foster, and his uncle, Robert Lansing, were men who achieved prominence, wealth, and an identical title: Secretary of State of the United States.

Matching the achievements of his grandfather and uncle, without breaking faith with his father, is not a task which our present Secretary of State consciously assigned to himself in his boyhood. Yet this difficult ambition is woven unmistakably in his career—and it has helped make him the most intriguing and the most controversial figure in the Eisenhower administration.

Dwight D. Eisenhower has called Mr. Dulles the greatest Secretary of State he knows anything about. RICHARD NIXON once said, "Isn't it wonderful to have a Secretary of State who stands up to the Russians?" But to Randolph Churchill is attributed the remark that he "smells of nonconformism," and the Democratic view is typified by Senator HENRY M. JACKSON's contention that Mr. Dulles is "the original misguided missile, traveling fast, making lots of noise, and never hitting the target."

Mr. Harsch goes on to say:

Assessments of Mr. Dulles seem usually to fall into one or the other of these extremes.

The article is a very interesting one. It continues by analyzing the complex nature of this man. I wish to make it a part of my remarks about the Secretary; therefore I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### JOHN FOSTER DULLES: A VERY COMPLICATED MAN

(By Joseph C. Harsch)

John Foster Dulles' father was a Presbyterian clergyman, dally and earnestly concerned with righteousness and duty. Both his maternal grandfather, John W. Foster, and his uncle, Robert Lansing, were men who achieved prominence, wealth, and an identical title: Secretary of State of the United States.

Matching the achievements of his grandfather and uncle, without breaking faith with his father, is not a task which our present Secretary of State consciously assigned to himself in his boyhood. Yet this difficult ambition is woven unmistakably into

his career—and it has helped make him the most intriguing and the most controversial figure in the Eisenhower administration.

Dwight D. Eisenhower has called Mr. Dulles the greatest Secretary of State he knows anything about. RICHARD NIXON once said, "Isn't it wonderful to have a Secretary of State who stands up to the Russians?" But to Randolph Churchill is attributed the remark that he "smells of nonconformism," and the Democratic view is typified by Senator HENRY M. JACKSON's contention that Mr. Dulles is "the original misguided missile, traveling fast, making lots of noise, and never hitting the target."

Assessments of Mr. Dulles seem usually to fall into one or the other of these extremes. One of the many curious things about him is the fact that he tends to arouse either approval bordering on veneration, or disapproval ranging close to moral contempt. Those who have worked closely with him in business and in government seldom view him dispassionately. This is surprising, when it is noted that in his personal relations Mr. Dulles is gregarious, sociable, a genial dinner-table companion, lucid in exposition, reasonable and openminded in discussion.

British diplomats—who were prepared to dislike him after their relatively successful relations with Dean Acheson—will tell you privately (never publicly, for that would do too much violence to a British folklore presumption of original Dulles sin) that he is very good in private negotiations, and much better than Acheson, you know, on the colonial question.

Mr. Dulles himself has probably contributed more than anyone to the confusion and controversy which surrounds his career. Because of him, "liberation," "unleashing," "massive retaliation," "agonizing reappraisal," and "brink of war" have become clichés in the current vernacular of Washington. They are often used with a connotation of an empty pose.

He is more vulnerable to criticism from his own publicly spoken record than from any other source, because in his official life he is given to overstatements, oversimplification, and less than total candor—flaws which are usually absent from his private conversations.

A substantial explanation of the dualism between his public and private behavior is that he progressed from being a small-town preacher's son to his present eminence by way of the legal profession. For years his daily task was to make the best case he could for his client. He is reputed to have been the most highly paid corporation lawyer in the history of New York City. A lawyer is not expected to believe the partisan side of the case which he presents for his client. He does not carry it into his personal beliefs or private conversations. Nor is consistency expected. He may take the opposite side of the same argument on behalf of his next client. Such professional habits are not easily shaken off.

### COURTROOM DIPLOMACY

Mr. Dulles earned his position in the legal profession against odds. He got his job with the law firm of Sullivan & Cromwell at \$50 per month on the insistence of Grandfather Foster and against the better judgment of the senior partners. The partners consented to give him a chance, but they took negligible interest in a boy from the back country who had slight connections with the big families or big corporations—and who, besides, had taken his law at George Washington University, not at Yale or Harvard. The fact that he had graduated with the highest marks ever granted at George Washington was no compensation in their eyes for his other shortcomings.

The quality which broke through the resistance of Sullivan and Cromwell and made him, ultimately, the senior partner was his



ability to make a case for a client. He did it so successfully that not until he reached the age of 61 did he experience what could be called a check to his career. Then, in 1949, he ran for the Senate, and was beaten by Herbert Lehman.

The technique of making a case for a client has persisted into his conduct of American diplomacy, and not surprisingly it has involved him in instances of embarrassing inconsistency. When he was in Pakistan last March, for example, he argued to members of the SEATO alliance that it pays to be an ally of the United States—citing facts and figures to prove that allies get better treatment at the United States Treasury than nonallies. Seven days later he was in non-allied Indonesia saying, "there is no connection whatsoever" between our financial aid and membership in a military-security pact with the United States. He cited as evidence the fact that India and Ceylon receive such aid although they are not allied with the United States.

In between he stopped over in New Delhi and tried to persuade Prime Minister Nehru that he had not been unfriendly to India when he had previously referred to Goa, that much debated Portuguese enclave on the Indian coast, as a province of Portugal.

Another striking example of making a case was provided by Mr. Dulles on February 24, 1956. The new Soviet diplomacy had for months been running rings around Western diplomacy. Soviet arms had gone to Egypt, Soviet trade delegations were roving as far afield as Latin America, Pakistan had agreed to send a trade mission to Moscow, and the administration had entangled itself in the on-again, off-again fiasco of tank shipments to Saudi Arabia. Yet Mr. Dulles asserted: "At this moment in Moscow they are having to revise their whole program. They have failed."

This was followed by one of the rare explosions of Senate, and public, criticism of Mr. Dulles (there had been an earlier explosion over his "massive retaliation" phrase). It evoked an explanation at the State Department that Mr. Dulles' doctrine of Soviet failure was based on a comparison of the Soviet position in 1948 with the Soviet position in 1956. Now the West was undoubtedly better off in 1956 than it had been in 1948—but what critics had been talking about was the appearance of a Western decline from 1953 to 1956. Mr. Dulles had built his case for Soviet failure on a convenient selection of dates which gave him the advantages of the Marshall plan, formation of the NATO alliance, successful resistance to aggression in Korea, and the refurbishing of Western military power—all pre-1952 Truman-Acheson achievements, which Mr. Dulles had tended to minimize in the 1952 election year. He may have felt, however, that his client had changed, after the Democrats regained control of Congress in 1954.

Certain inconsistencies between remarks made by Mr. Dulles during the 1952 campaign and in a 1949 Senate speech were raised at the Senate hearing on his confirmation in January of 1953. Mr. Dulles explained that "under our constitutional system we have a general election every 4 years \* \* \* one side presents his case, and the other side presents the other case, as two lawyers do when they go into court. At that stage the two parties are not judges and they are not judicial. In my opinion they should not be \* \* \* but when that time is past, then I believe we should try to work together on a bipartisan basis."

When Life magazine came on the streets in early January of 1956 with an article based on recorded conversations with Mr. Dulles which pictured him as almost the sole bulwark of the peace, Democrats concluded that Mr. Dulles' quadrennial release from judicialness had come around. Even Vice President Nixon commented dryly that "the rest of us can take care of the campaigning."

Another characteristic of many distinguished lawyers is the lack of an administrative flair. (This is, perhaps, natural, since they ordinarily work alone or with a handful of close associates, and thus have little chance to learn the techniques of managing a large organization.) In Mr. Dulles this trait seems to be pronounced.

Sullivan & Cromwell partners recall that when Dulles was senior partner he exhibited more than usual aversion to administrative work. The senior partner normally oversees this part of the firm's operations—as the present senior partner, Arthur Dean, does. During the Dulles term, however, one of the other partners took over this work by mutual and tacit consent.

Shortly before taking office as Secretary of State Mr. Dulles expressed a wish that he might have an "ivory tower" office off in some obscure corner of the White House where he could just think about foreign policy, and not have any formal connection with the vast, complex, hierarchical structure of the Department of State. He did not get his wish, but his subordinates have sometimes suspected that in his own subconscious mind he did. It is frequently said that he carries the foreign policies of the United States around in his coat pocket. He seldom delegates policy responsibility and it is noteworthy that—as in the case of the Saudi Arabian arms shipments—no one was quite sure what the policy was until he came back from his Duck Island vacation retreat.

The once-powerful secondary officials of the Department have tended to become merely executors of his policy (when they are informed of what it is) and the rank of Ambassador has steadily declined in importance during the Dulles incumbency. When there is any important negotiating to be done Mr. Dulles usually goes himself, leaving his Ambassadors no function higher than that of reporters. Even this residual function has been of declining relevance, since Mr. Dulles has his own views of each situation clearly in mind. Ambassadorial reports bear upon Dulles' thinking, but seldom influence it; and, it is said, they never cause a reversal of a strong Dulles view. Ambassadors have been called home for consultation without being consulted by Mr. Dulles.

During the Acheson period, policy was generated out of the impact upon each other of many and diverse minds in the Department. Mr. Acheson set up and used an institution called the policy planning staff. He frequently overrode its conclusions, but he did not assume that his thinking alone could generate foreign policy. Today the policy planning staff has fallen into disuse: Department policy begins and ends in Mr. Dulles' own mind. Dulles' policy is influenced heavily by the Senate. It is sometimes reversed by the President. It is adjusted within the limits of tolerance of public opinion. But the machinery of the State Department plays the least of the roles in the process.

The fact that Mr. Dulles is one of the most traveled Secretaries of State in history is a direct result of his unfamiliarity with the use of an administrative apparatus. To him, his staff of experts, his farflung Foreign Service, appear to be not an instrument, but a baffling encumbrance from which he disengages himself insofar as he is able.

James F. Byrnes—another lawyer—exhibited a similar inclination, although to a lesser degree. When he was negotiating with the Soviets in Moscow in 1945, one of his aids (now an Ambassador) suggested that the delegation ought to send a report of its work back to the State Department. "Why?" Mr. Byrnes inquired in genuine bewilderment. "What would be the point of that? I'm here."

Mr. Dulles also is capable of assuming that wherever he happens to be at the moment, there, too, is the Department of State. In

his case, however, it comes closer to being true.

A related quality is his facility for disentangling himself from embarrassments. In 1947 he had nominated Alger Hiss, with the highest recommendations, for the post of director of the Carnegie Endowment. When the pumpkin papers were unearthed in August 1948 he and Dean Acheson were both vulnerable to criticism, because of their past associations with Hiss; Mr. Dulles was, if anything, more so because he had provided Hiss with refuge at the Carnegie Endowment after Hiss had been maneuvered out of the State Department under Mr. Byrnes.

#### A MATTER OF THEOLOGY

At once Mr. Dulles relieved Hiss of all active duties at the Carnegie Endowment. He appeared as a prosecution witness at both of the Hiss trials. He contradicted Hiss testimony on five specific points during the final stage of the second trial. By the day of the verdict, January 21, 1949, he was ready to say:

"The conviction of Alger Hiss is a human tragedy. It is tragic that so great promise should have come to so inglorious an end. But the greater tragedy is that seemingly our national ideals no longer inspire the loyal devotion needed for their defense." (Some 25,000 American boys were shortly to challenge Mr. Dulles' lugubrious generalization by giving their lives on the battlefields of Korea.)

Precisely 4 days later Dean Acheson—citing as his text the 25th chapter of the Gospel according to St. Matthew, verses 34 through 46, the theological basis on which the ministers of the Christian church follow even a convicted murderer to the scaffold—said:

"I should like to make clear to you that whatever the outcome of any appeal which Mr. Hiss or his lawyers may make in this case, I do not intend to turn my back on Alger Hiss."

Some philosophic observers of the two men see in this disparity of reaction to the same incident an outbreak of the ancient conflict between Presbyterian and Episcopalian: the one prudently turning his back, the other defiantly wearing past mistakes. If there is self-righteousness in either position, or both, it is a matter for a panel of theologians to determine.

The triple reconciliation of righteousness, duty, and success is not always an easy one. Theologians would also be intrigued by the way Mr. Dulles resolved it when he had to deal with the controversial personnel cases which he inherited from his predecessor. The McCarthy group in Congress had declared total war against a number of Foreign Service career officers, in particular, John Carter Vincent and John Paton Davies.

Mr. Dulles dutifully went through the long records and found—as Mr. Acheson had—that there was no basis for dismissal on the ground of doubtful loyalty. But he divested himself prudently of Mr. Vincent on the ground that his China reporting had been a failure, and of Mr. Davies for disregard of proper forbearance and caution in making known his dissents outside privileged boundaries. His personal feelings about the Davies case may or may not be suggested by the fact that on the day after he had announced his decision he telephoned Mr. Davies and authorized him to use his (the Dulles) name as a reference if it would be helpful in obtaining another job. His final session with Mr. Vincent ended on the Dulles observation (apparently conclusive to Mr. Dulles) that Mr. Vincent's critics in the Senate talked louder than his supporters.

The rationale of Dulles' defenders in these matters is that when a man is trying to do something as important as preserving the peace of the world he cannot afford to carry excess baggage, any more than can a man

trying to climb Mount Everest. Mr. Dulles found ways and means of shedding the liabilities which had plagued Mr. Acheson unless, as in the case of Charles E. Bohlen, the defenders could muster stronger support than the critics. Dwight D. Eisenhower and Senator Robert Taft both spoke up for Mr. Bohlen. Dulles' detractors on the other hand use such words as "hypocrisy" and "moral cowardice" in speaking of these cases.

It is not clear whether the free run which Senator McCARTHY enjoyed around the State Department in the early Dulles days represented Dulles' prudence or orders from the White House. It has been noted that when Harold Stassen did talk back to Senator McCARTHY in those same days he was repudiated by the White House.

Dulles' adaptability to changed circumstances was tested, and confirmed, by his relations with his son Avery. Mr. Dulles himself has been loyal to his father's Presbyterianism in personal faith, in constant references in his public life to moral and spiritual values, and in considerable prominence as a layman in the work of the National Council of the Churches of Christ, an organization of Protestant churches. When Avery Dulles entered the Roman Catholic Church to study for the Jesuit priesthood, Mr. Dulles broke off relations with his son. Relations were established before photographers when Dulles became a candidate for Senator.

There are plenty of other examples of Mr. Dulles' adaptability. When he visited South Korea just before the outbreak of war he promised the South Koreans that they would "not stand alone" in the event of attack. Back in Washington, he confided to reporters that he was vastly relieved when President Truman ordered United States troops into the Korean battle, for otherwise his promise of support to the South Koreans would have remained unfulfilled. From the outbreak of the war until the 1952 campaign he defended the Truman decision to enter the war. He then became critical of that decision during the campaign; but returned to its defense after the 1954 mid-term elections put a Democratic majority back in control of the Senate.

He contributed comfort and usable quotations to the Bricker amendment cause during the 1952 campaign, but turned against the amendment when it came toward a vote in 1953.

#### WHAT HE SAYS AND DOES

The qualities which make Mr. Dulles controversial show up in his control of foreign policy. One usually knew with Acheson what his policy was trying to achieve. With Mr. Dulles one is not quite sure whether the American attitude toward Communist China, for example, is to be measured by the fact that he refused to shake hands with his Chinese opposite number, Chou En-lai, when they were in the same room in Geneva in 1954, or by the fact that since July of 1955 a United States Ambassador and a Communist Chinese Ambassador have been accredited to each other in Geneva.

Dulles' admirers cite his famous brink-of-war doctrine as evidence of his mastery of the technique of foreign relations. They take seriously his version of events, which is that he has deliberately taken the United States to the brink and thus saved the peace by his boldness.

His own version of how he got the Chinese Communists to agree to the truce in Korea is that when in India, on his first of many trips around the world, he told Prime Minister Nehru that if there were no truce the United States would open up the war and carry it across the Manchurian frontier. In the Dulles version of history Mr. Nehru presumably relayed this stern warning to Peking, after which the truce was concluded. But Mr. Nehru has since been reported as saying that if Mr. Dulles ever told him any such

thing on that trip he, Mr. Nehru, didn't take it seriously enough even to remember it, let alone relay it to Peking.

The greatest single controversy over Dulles' conduct of foreign policy is whether Mr. Dulles has shaped events, or adjusted himself to them. Facts permit one to say only that at the end of Mr. Dulles' third year in office his policy was almost diametrically opposed to what he said it was going to be when he started out. His opening declaration was to take United States policy off the alleged dead center of Acheson's containment, inject boldness into it, and by boldness liberate the captured peoples of the Soviet realm and roll back the Iron Curtain.

Perhaps the most characteristically Dullesian operation was the one involving the famous Formosa Resolution. Congress was asked for what amounted to a blank check, authorizing the President to do almost anything to save Formosa. The country braced itself for war with China, and the world shuddered. But when the 7th Fleet steamed westward under cover of the resolution it did not fire its broadsides against the Communists on the China coast, but merely evacuated the Chinese Nationalists from the Tachen Islands, then turned quickly away. The affair left people wondering whether the resolution was intended to protect the Chinese Nationalists in the Far East or to cover the Dulles flank on Capitol Hill. And was the 7th Fleet spared from attack by Chinese Communist planes because of the much publicized resolution, or because urgent unpublicized advices sent from the State Department to Peking by way of London, Moscow, and New Delhi had explained that the fleet maneuver was solely intended for the evacuation of the islands?

In pre- and early-Secretarial days Mr. Dulles spoke often and critically of the Acheson containment policy. The implication always was that he intended to go over from passive containment to an active roll-back of the Soviet frontiers of power. But the fascinating fact is that as the months elapsed and the Communist frontiers rolled over half of Indochina, Dulles' pronouncements on foreign policy more and more frequently included passages which sounded much like the theories of George F. Kennan, author of the containment doctrine.

The essence of Kennan doctrine was stated in the following passages from Mr. Kennan's Stafford Little Lectures of March 1954:

"I can conceive that Soviet power will some day recede from its present exposed positions, just as it has already receded in Finland and Yugoslavia and northern Iran. But I can conceive of this happening only precisely in the event that the vital prestige of Soviet power is not too drastically and abruptly engaged in the process, in the event that change is permitted to come gradually and inconspicuously as the result of compulsions resident within the structure of Soviet power itself, not created externally in the form of threats or ultimata or patent intrigues from the outside."

In 1952 during the election campaign and long thereafter, Mr. Dulles advocated policies toward the Soviet Union which bore some of the external earmarks of threats, ultimata, and patent intrigue although he would not himself of course put such labels upon them. Instant and massive retaliation sounded rather like a threat. The warning to the Chinese Communists extended through Mr. Nehru partook of the quality of an ultimatum. And the liberation policy sounded rather like a patent intrigue, for Mr. Dulles never made it clear how he intended to bring about this desirable end; he just kept hinting at various ways and means of giving the Soviets homework and difficulties in their own backyard. He seemed to imply an intensified psychological warfare and propaganda offensive abetted by undercover CIA work. He never spelled it out in detail beyond the creation in the

free world of political task forces to develop a freedom program for each of the captive nations.

There does seem to have been a stepup in CIA undercover operations against the Communist bloc in the early days of Dulles' regime. The Committee for Free Europe was also for a time stimulated to greater activities. But by 1954 Washington had begun to demobilize the Chinese Nationalist division which had tried to operate in northern Burma against the Chinese Communist southern flank, and had begun to dismantle the CIA operation on Formosa known as Western Enterprises, Inc. Mr. Dulles had formally assured the United Nations, as early as September 15, 1953, that "our creed does not call for exporting revolution and inciting others to violence." Long after this the Committee for Free Europe continued to float its "freedom balloons" across the Iron Curtain, but everyone knew that the forward strategy of the early Eisenhower days had been laid aside. The Free Europe people, whose hopes had been focused on liberation by revolution, wondered plaintively just what was their continuing function.

So much attention was paid to the massive retaliation phrase in the famous speech of January 12, 1954, that few at the time noticed the balancing Kennanesque passage: "If we can deter such aggression as would mean general war, and that is our confident resolve, then we can let time and fundamentals work for us."

On March 17, 1954, in an expansion of this thesis, he was sure that "there is going on, even within the Soviet empire, a silent test of strength between the powerful rulers and the multitudes of human beings \* \* \* their aspirations in the aggregate make up a mighty force." This was further documentation for the thesis that "time and fundamentals will work for us, if only we will let them."

On the day Mr. Kennan had his final farewell session with Mr. Dulles he spent a long evening of soul-searching with an old friend. At the end of the conversation, Mr. Kennan remarked that he supposed that Mr. Dulles could not after all pursue a Kennan policy as long as he, Kennan, remained in the State Department. Mr. Dulles continued to use bold words along with his Kennanesque passages, but certainly by February 8, 1955, the men of the Kremlin had taken the real measure of the bold words. On that date Vyacheslav Molotov said to the Supreme Soviet of the Soviet Union: " \* \* \* the Republicans won the presidential elections not because they proclaimed a more aggressive foreign policy, but, on the contrary, by virtue of the fact that they actually appeared to be for a certain time the political party which was furthering not the continuation of aggression in Korea but the ending of the war and the reestablishment of peace in that country."

Paul Nitze, Mr. Acheson's last chairman of the Policy Planning Staff, studied the Dulles record and published an article in Foreign Affairs (January 1954) analyzing the difference between declaratory policy and operation policy. The Dulles declaratory policy has been all that the most ardent warhawks on Capitol Hill could desire, but his operating policies began with a private explanation after Chiang Kai-shek had been "unleashed" that real United States policy in the Far East was one of disengagement from the mainland of Asia.

The United States has not yet disengaged entirely from the coast of Asia, but its armed power, its psychological warfare, and its propaganda have steadily receded from the frontiers of the power struggle. Under Mr. Dulles the actions, though not the voice, of the United States have beat less and less vigorously on the vital prestige of Soviet power and have given increasing opportunity for the compulsions resident within the structure of Soviet power to operate.



Whether Mr. Dulles ever consciously practiced Kennan policy, while declaring a contrary policy, is a secret Mr. Dulles has never disclosed. But it is obvious that there has been a gradual flow of Dulles policy around the clock from denunciation of Kennan doctrine toward the actual practice of Kennan policy.

#### INSIDE HIS OFFICE

Did Mr. Dulles play it this way from the start, or simply adjust himself to events as they changed? The answer is obscured by many things, including Mr. Dulles' own methods of operation as a Secretary of State. An Assistant Secretary of State who attended his daily staff conference for many months is sure that if he entered the Dulles office at any other than the scheduled time, Mr. Dulles would not be able to recall his name.

In Mr. Acheson's day the upper levels of the State Department seethed with new ideas. Under Mr. Dulles, policy originates with Dulles texts. The fitness of one Ambassador for promotion was questioned on the ground that he had exhibited ignorance of a particular Dulles speech.

Two theories are equally permissible about Dulles' conduct of our foreign policy. One is that with a truly Machiavellian skill he has kept the Senate war-wing happy by his public pronouncements, while quietly paying the way for a settlement with the Communist world by his actual operations. The other theory is that the domestic Soviet aftermath of Stalin's death—coupled with a vast American urge for peace which seized upon Dwight Eisenhower as its instrument—have together produced a more relaxed world with which Mr. Dulles has, if sometimes tardily, come to terms.

One theory among those who have worked with him is that Mr. Dulles is more preoccupied with the record of John Foster Dulles on the pages of history than with history itself. He seems to be singularly unaware of other people around him, and their possible corollary contributions to events. The "brink of war" article in *Life* attributes the peace exclusively to Dulles' technique—leaving one to wonder what Dag Hammarskjöld, Nehru, Anthony Eden, Winston Churchill, Dwight Eisenhower, and several others were doing with their time.

At a ceremonial occasion convoked for the presentation of an award in international jurisprudence to Dr. Manley O. Hudson, Mr. Dulles made a long speech on international jurisprudence. He made no mention whatever of Dr. Hudson. One person present remarked that it seemed to him "an extraordinary example of gracelessness in an intelligent man." The thoughts of more than one member of the audience went back to Mr. Dulles' opening letter to the employees of the State Department when he took over command with the announced expectation of receiving their "personal loyalty."

Mr. Dulles is unquestionably intelligent. He is beyond doubt a highly skilled negotiator. He is a brilliant pleader of a case. There is no record of any client ever having been dissatisfied with the Dulles handling of his legal affairs. He is a candid and articulate expounder of a complex problem in foreign affairs. His knowledge of such problems and his ability to grasp their ramifications is probably unequaled by any other foreign minister of these times.

But, curiously enough, there seems to be a lurking lack of self-confidence, or perhaps nonfulfillment, somewhere in his makeup—as though in his own mind grandfather John Foster still loomed unmatched over him. Mr. Dulles has made a far larger splash on the pages of history than the grandfather whom others have long since forgotten; but perhaps the grandson is still subconsciously a member of the clergyman's branch of the family, made uncomfortable

by grandfather's condescension toward his poor and more obscure relatives.

In the process either of making the peace, or of adjusting his record to the peacemaking work of others (take your choice), Mr. Dulles has chalked up one incontrovertible score over his predecessor. There have been grumblings on Capitol Hill from time to time, but never any real revolt against Mr. Dulles. The Senate voted its nonconfidence in Dean Acheson just before Mr. Acheson went to Brussels to negotiate the NATO alliance (which the Senate then ratified). No such public humiliation has ever been visited upon Mr. Dulles.

It can certainly be said of Mr. Dulles that he has successfully shielded himself and President Eisenhower's foreign policies from attack in the Senate. Whether he has actually generated American foreign policy is a further question which cannot be answered surely from the existing public record. Mr. Acheson and Mr. Kennan did generate policy. Mr. Dulles has steered old policies through a number of storms, and often steered wisely and well. At least, he kept the policies afloat.

Technically, Mr. Dulles has initiated only two new policies since he took office. One was the treaty of alliance with Chiang Kai-shek. The other was the "northern tier" policy in the Middle East which the British converted into the Baghdad Pact. It is not necessarily a mark against him that neither of these policies has produced spectacularly successful results, nor that there are only two. It may be that he best served the needs of the times by steering old policies along old courses. Congress has unquestionably been more comfortable during Dulles' steering than it was during Acheson's generating—although it did vote, and heavily, in favor of every Acheson policy presented to it (albeit attacking Mr. Acheson personally). Mr. Dulles has yet to test his ability to carry a major new policy of his own through Congress.

But the conduct of foreign policy does not consist exclusively of negotiating formal treaties, implementing formal statements of policy, and generating concepts like the Marshall plan and the NATO alliance. Policy can also be the absence of action. It may even involve the absence of action under the cover of much verbal sound and fury. Mr. Dulles inherited from Mr. Acheson a public opinion which demanded bold statements of defiance against the Communist world, but which also yearned for an end to the Korean war, and release from the fear of a greater atomic war.

#### THE TWO-WAY CHARGE

The Secretary has marvelously served these conflicting desires. He has appeared to be the crusading knight bearing the cross of righteousness on his shield, his sword upraised against the foe and his voice calling for the charge. But if your glance descends from this stirring picture, you notice that the charger he bestrides is ambling placidly in the opposite direction.

The spring crisis in Arab-Israeli affairs shows the characteristic earmark of a Dulles operation. At suitable intervals Mr. Dulles loudly called upon the Soviets to prove their good intentions by deeds, not words. But when Soviet arms flowed into Egypt Mr. Dulles inconspicuously noted that Moscow had a legal right to do what it did. Britain, in anguish over the apparent threat to its Middle East oil supplies, reversed its ancient pro-Arab inclination, sided with Israel, and tried to involve the United States under the 1952 Tripartite Declaration. Mr. Dulles deftly sidestepped this London move by invoking the United Nations, thus leaving the door open for Soviet participation in a settlement.

There was no formalized declaration or implementation of policy in this operation.

There were no documents. There was a risk that the Soviets would seek dangerous advantage from the leaning of Mr. Dulles away from London. But it was not the kind of risk Mr. Dulles takes in the picture of his behavior beloved alike by his adulators and his detractors. History is likely to record that Mr. Dulles has taken more and bolder risks on the brink of appeasement than on the brink of war.

It is perhaps premature to suggest that whereas the times of Stalin called for a Secretary of State who literally did stand up to Russians, the times of Khrushchev call for one who will make peace with them behind a smokescreen of threatening words. We know that the men of Moscow were shaken out of some of their illusions by the resistance of the West in Korea. We do not know yet whether they understand and will respond to Mr. Dulles' extraordinary way of riding foreign policy backwards. And it is much too early to decide whether the Dulles way of riding is intentional or accidental.

In the meantime, in spite of all criticism, Mr. Dulles continues to ride American foreign policy as though it belonged to him by inherited right.

He took office with the following statement to his assembled employees in the courtyard of the State Department:

"I don't suppose that there is any family in the United States which has for so long been identified with the Foreign Service and the State Department as my family. I go back a long way—I'd have to stop and think of the date—when a great-great uncle of mine, Mr. Welsh, was one of our early Ministers to the Court of St. James. In those days, you know, they were Ministers, not Ambassadors.

"My grandfather, John W. Foster, was for a long time in the diplomatic service and then ended up as Secretary of State under President Harrison. His son-in-law, my uncle, Robert Lansing, was Secretary of State under Woodrow Wilson.

"Coming down to my own generation, my brother, Allen W. Dulles, was for many years in the Foreign Service of the United States. My sister, Eleanor Lansing Dulles, is today in the State Department and has been for several years. I, myself, have had at least sporadic association with the Department of State and with the Foreign Service throughout most of my life. So you can see, from the standpoint of background and tradition, it is to me an exciting and thrilling thing to be with you here today, as Secretary of State."

To Mr. Dulles the State Department has become a family fief. He inherited it by feudal right, he and his family, of which he is the senior living member.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have not changed my opinion, as previously expressed on the floor of the Senate, about the Secretary of State, namely, that I think his usefulness in his position has long since passed. It is only necessary to look at the sorry mess in the Middle East to have all the proof one needs.

The Senate has before it for consideration a resolution which I do not think anyone can deny was principally authored by the Secretary of State. As I brought out in my colloquy yesterday with the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], the committees listened to the Secretary of State over a period of days. Questions which ought to have been answered by him specifically were answered with lengthy, evasive language. It was too bad we did not have Mr. Dulles in a courtroom, where he could have been tied down to answering directly, under the rules of

examination which prevail in court-rooms.

Mr. President, I cannot possibly vote for a resolution which is so strongly recommended by the Secretary of State until he supplies the Senate with a bill of particulars, which we are entitled to receive from him, as to exactly what he, as Secretary of State, proposes to do under the resolution if the broad blanket power is voted as provided in the resolution.

I recognize the seriousness of the comments which I make when I express publicly my lack of confidence in the Secretary of State. But I shall not vote for a resolution which gives this blanket authority to the administration with John Foster Dulles as Secretary of State. I want to know what deals he has in mind under the Middle East program. I am not going to accept him on faith. I think the taxpayers of the country are entitled to know specifically what John Foster Dulles will recommend to the administration if the blanket authority contained in the resolution is voted to the administration.

As I said earlier this morning, I think there are increasing thousands of people in the United States who, day by day, as the debate proceeds in the Senate, are beginning to ask themselves some very interesting and penetrating questions. Senators need only to read their mail each morning to know how true that statement is. The people of the Nation are entitled to know what the administration intends to do under the resolution, because the foreign policy of the country belongs to the people and not to the President of the United States and the Secretary of State.

Mr. President, I have made these brief comments this morning, based upon the article published in Harper's magazine, because I think the article itself raises very serious questions as to the competency of the Secretary of State to continue to perform the duties of that office.

Mr. President, I now desire to address myself to another subject.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

#### RUSSIAN POWER PRODUCTION IS INCREASING

**Mr. MORSE.** Mr. President, I desire to discuss an excellent article entitled "Russia Increasing Power Production," written by Marquis Childs, and published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of today.

A group of us in the Senate have for a long time sought to point out the very great danger to the security of our country which is being created by this administration through its power program. After all, it is the sources of energy available to private enterprise in the United States which give us the assurance of whether our productive power will increase in relation to Russia's, or whether we shall find ourselves secondary to Russia in a very few years. As Marquis Childs points out:

Public power development was a conspicuous feature of the New and Fair Deals. It figured, too, in the election campaign last

fall in many Western States, including those in which the Democrats scored unexpected gains.

When Douglas McKay came in as Secretary of the Interior, this concept was quickly vetoed and a study recommending it was put on the prescribed list. But from areas where power shortages are acute there is evidence of dissatisfaction with this veto.

The Portland Oregonian, a Republican paper—

And, I may add parenthetically, one of the most active anti-Morse newspapers in the recent campaign—

expressing editorially the hope of a change in power policy, noted that the Interior Department under McKay "had even sold its transmission line through central Oregon to Klamath County to California-Oregon Power Co."

"This prevented," the editorial noted, "effective interconnection between the Federal Bonneville system and the Federal Central Valley system of California. Had this connection been completed, the Northwest probably could be utilizing power from California on an exchange basis this winter rather than cutting off a third of its aluminum production."

The President of the United States is saying much these days—and rightly so, in my opinion—about the dangers to the security of our country; but I direct his attention to what I believe to be the fact, namely, that his own power policy, with the give-away partnership program which the President is underwriting, also endangers the security of our country in the years not too far ahead, because that policy deals with the matter of developing the maximum energy potentials of this Nation.

The President of the United States, I charge, is following a policy in the power field which will not develop the maximum energy potential of the great river basins because he has been drawn in by unsound advisers, in my judgment, and is following the bad advice of those advisers in regard to his partnership scheme, which will turn over great power resources to the private utilities, not for the maximum power development, but for underdevelopment.

That is why I think it is so important that the Senate give consideration to the excellent article written by Mr. Marquis Childs and published this morning. Mr. Childs has hit the nail on the head, in my judgment, in regard to the issue of the development of a power program in Russia as compared with the underdevelopment program in the United States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### RUSSIA INCREASING POWER PRODUCTION

(By Marquis Childs)

The startling statement that the United States has already lost the lead in science to Soviet Russia, made with the authority of Edward Teller, who developed the hydrogen bomb, should shake the complacency which assumes that high prosperity and shiny new automobiles are evidence of superiority.

What Teller confirmed was what many scientists and educators have long suspected. The extraordinary push of Soviet technical

and scientific education has achieved in a relatively short time the leadership that this country has held for many years.

But it is not alone in science that America's preeminent position is threatened. In many fields the rate of growth in the Soviet Union exceeds that of the United States. One of these is the development of electric power production.

Recent estimates made by power specialists show that in the period 1951-55 Russia's installed hydroelectric power capacity increased at the rate of 80 percent, while the rate of growth in this country was 29 percent.

These are rough estimates, especially in view of the uncertain nature of Soviet statistics. But they give a general idea of the order of difference in the growth of this element vital to the development of industry, technology, and science.

Soviet power production today is only a fraction of that in the United States, which has 42 percent of all the installed capacity in the world, according to a study made by the International Cooperation Administration.

But if the rate of growth continues to be 2 or 3 times that of the United States, then we may wake up one day to discover the same thing has happened in power production as has occurred in science. In power produced from coal and natural gas, the rate of growth for the Soviet in the same period was 63 percent against 30 percent for this country.

Among those concerned over this threat are advocates of public power production who believe the policy of the present administration is preventing the construction of large-scale projects that only Government can build.

Public power development was a conspicuous feature of the New and Fair Deals. It figured, too, in the election campaign last fall in many Western States, including those in which the Democrats scored unexpected gains.

When Douglas McKay came in as Secretary of Interior, this concept was quickly vetoed and a study recommending it was put on the prescribed list. But from areas where power shortages are acute there is evidence of dissatisfaction with this veto.

The Portland Oregonian, a Republican paper, expressing editorially the hope of a change in power policy, noted that the Interior Department under McKay "had even sold its transmission line through central Oregon to Klamath County to California-Oregon Power Co."

"This prevented," the editorial noted, "effective interconnection between the Federal Bonneville system and the Federal Central Valley system of California. Had this connection been completed, the Northwest probably could be utilizing power from California on an exchange basis this winter rather than cutting off a third of its aluminum production."

A vast intercontinental grid is the core of Soviet power development. This was described by Shelton Fisher, publisher of Power, a McGraw-Hill business publication, after a visit to the Soviet Union last fall.

In a 3-hour interview, Georgi Malenkov, Minister of Power, explained how the grid would link up the great hydroelectric resources in Siberia with the central power area around Moscow, including eight nuclear powerplants to be in operation by 1960. Fisher made an extensive tour of Soviet power facilities.

The Bratsk Dam under construction in Siberia will be 3 miles across and 425 feet high. Yearly production at Bratsk is expected to total 20 billion kilowatt-hours. Total hydro production consumed in Russia in 1955 was 28 billion which gives some idea of the scale of development now going forward. Bratsk will be producing power by 1960.



### DISPLAY OF THE AMERICAN FLAG OVER SCHOOLHOUSES

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, the schools of the United States are the fountainhead of civic responsibility. In the classrooms of poor communities—often overcrowded, filled with worn desks, smelling of chalk—and in the bright glass-walled school buildings of wealthier areas, young people from every walk of life are learning and practicing the great principles upon which our concept of government rests.

Sixty-three years ago, the first United States flag to be raised over a school building was raised in the small town of Gaylord, in my own State of Michigan. Today that patriotic idea has become a great American tradition, sanctioned by law. Every school in the land flies the red, white, and blue symbol which throughout the world is synonymous with freedom and equality.

I offer for inclusion in the RECORD an excerpt from the Otsego County, Mich., school directory, which recounts this story from its beginnings in Gaylord, Mich., to its present status in our national patriotic lore.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE MUST WORK FOR FREEDOM TO MAKE FREEDOM WORK FOR US

#### "PLEDGE TO THE FLAG"

"I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands; one nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

Sixty-three years ago the first United States flag to be raised over a school building, was raised in the small town of Gaylord, Mich., in Otsego County, and over a small, insignificant school.

There was opposition to this from Civil War veterans.

The school fought for a referendum and won out. The issue was carried to the State legislature and it was made a State law that the United States flag be flown over school buildings. Eventually every State in the Union made it mandatory to display the United States flag over the buildings or grounds of every school.

This move to make display of the flag mandatory was initiated by Gaylord High School 63 years ago. Its principal was Frank H. Farnham, who now lives in Pensacola, Fla.

Gaylord can be very proud of its contribution to the patriotic history of our country.

### INVESTIGATION OF INCREASING NEWSPRINT COSTS

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, zooming newsprint costs have become the center of an investigation by the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

At the time when I proposed the investigation, I pointed out on the Senate floor that these rising costs work a hardship on publishers, and therefore curtail the functioning of the free press of America. The small-business man finds himself squeezed in a vise which becomes tighter and tighter as his advertising costs rise along with newsprint costs. And beyond that, the average American is in the unpleasant position of paying almost twice as much for his daily newspaper as he did a few years ago.

On February 4, Mr. President, in my weekly report to the people of Michigan, I pointed out some of the underlying facts in this situation, and laid the blame on the doorstep of an international newspaper cartel which experts seem to think is manipulating prices for its own benefit. A distinguished Michigan newspaper, the Dearborn Independent, reprinted the newsletter in the form of an editorial. This is most gratifying, for it carries the assurance that efforts to identify the offenders are meeting with approval at home. Furthermore, it serves the laudable purpose of bringing the newsprint situation to the attention of a wider audience.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Dearborn Independent of February 8, 1957, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"Here you are, son," the man smiled as he tossed a nickel on the stand and picked up his daily paper.

"Sorry, mister," the boy replied, "it's 7 cents."

The man's smile faded. And with good reason, for the cost of newspapers everywhere is rising. It is happening in the big cities and spreading to the smaller communities. And as this occurs, it raises a very important question: Are you, the newspaper reader, trapped in the meshes of a cartel? Is the small-business man who must advertise to live—is the newspaper publisher himself—trapped in the same web?

The price of newsprint, which represents one-fourth of the cost of publishing a paper, has skyrocketed in the past few decades. Now comes a new increase of \$4 per ton, bringing newsprint costs to an all-time peak.

Advertisers once paid nominal rates for advertising. But now, rates have climbed steadily to a point where small-business men find it difficult to advertise at all.

The publisher suffers, too. Back in 1946, newsprint cost \$67 per ton. Last year, it was \$130 per ton. Such increases are forcing many newspapers out of business, causing some advertisers to stop advertising, and making John Q. Citizen pay more for his paper.

Naturally, the cost of manufacturing those bulky rolls of paper has gone up during the passing years. But production costs are way out of line compared to selling prices. For example, in 1946, it cost the mill \$44 to produce one ton of newsprint. Now, it costs \$76. Freight charges have risen only \$9 per ton in the last 10 years. In other words, manufacturing costs rose \$41 per ton. But the selling price rose \$63 per ton. All told, since 1933, the price of newsprint has zoomed by 325 percent.

That brings up the subject of profits. The St. Lawrence Corp. showed a 58.7 percent increase in profits for 1955 over 1954. Other companies had profits ranging from 20 percent to 45 percent for 1955 over 1954. When the new \$4-per-ton increase becomes effective on March 1, chances are that profits will soar again. American publishers will be paying \$23 million more than they did last year for the very same product. And in the end, the individual newspaper reader picks up the tab.

Incidentally, these price boosts always follow the same pattern. One newsprint manufacturer announces an increase and immediately the other producers follow suit with an identical price hike.

Is this a cartel fixing prices and restricting trade? It certainly looks that way and I've called for a Senate investigation. Probes of this kind have occurred before in the

newsprint industry in 1917, 1927, 1939, 1947 and 1951. Last week, on the Senate floor, I traced the long history of indictments in the background of this latest price hike. It may take international cooperation to get at the bottom of this—for 75 to 80 percent of our newsprint comes from Canada—but we intend to see that the offenders are identified and prosecuted.

CHARLES E. POTTER,  
United States Senator.

### PROMOTION OF PEACE AND STABILITY IN THE MIDDLE EAST

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 19) to authorize the President to undertake economic and military cooperation with nations in the general area of the Middle East in order to assist in the strengthening and defense of their independence.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I favor the Mideast Resolution, and support the policy of the President as submitted to the Congress. I believe that the resolution is all-important if the problems of the Mideast are to be solved, and that it marks a beginning in the firm recognition by the United States that leadership on Mid-East policy is not alone necessary within the United Nations, but also is necessary outside the United Nations, in order to deal with the major problems of this area, so critical to international peace.

Yesterday I listened to much of the debate upon this question, and I heard the protestations of the opponents of the pending joint resolution, partially based upon the number of things which we have to do in our own country in the development of our own resources. When I was in the other body, I think I voted for and advocated actively as many measures for the development of the natural resources of our country as did most other Members, perhaps as much as any other Member; but it struck me that the protests made against the pending joint resolution were directed to the state of the world, rather than to the state of our own country.

What we in the United States should understand is that we are dealing with abysmally low standards of living in the Mideast, generally lower than anything we can imagine, let alone so much worse than obtain in our own country as to be hardly comparable. Without in any way wishing to consider ourselves to be do-gooders—though I do not see why that would be considered invidious—it is a fact that the Soviet Union is competing with us, especially for the support of the people of the underdeveloped areas. We should know that if the largely uncommitted 1,200,000,000 people of the underdeveloped areas fall under the domination of the Soviet Union instead of being free, then our days could well be numbered. The Soviet mounts, in this competition, force plus fanaticism while we juxtapose productive power plus faith in human worth and dignity.

Unless we evidence in world affairs, the strength we possess, then we shall have yielded the field to the other side, with results which could be fatal.

One further point which has come into the discussion is the urgency of the

Mideast Resolution. It is my deep conviction that the resolution is urgent. Very properly and necessarily, time has been taken in a discussion of the resolution, but there is no reason for extending the time beyond that required to permit adequate debate and consideration. I am convinced the resolution is not only sound, but urgently needed, and for the reasons which I shall now submit.

Tension in the Mideast has been brought to the boiling point right now, not alone by the conditions, inherent in it, of medieval standards of living, health, sanitation, and social organization, not alone by hostility to European administering powers by the indigenous peoples, explosive as are these forces, but also by the fact that both of these explosive forces were manipulated by the Soviet Union for the purpose of creating the greatest amount of discord, confusion, hatred, and incitement to war in the area right now. The fact that the Soviet Union became a "big brother" to Egypt and Syria made out of intense nationalism a burning crisis and a dire threat to international peace.

The fever-heat period of the Mideast crisis began on September 27, 1955, when Egypt announced the conclusion of an agreement with Czechoslovakia to exchange Egyptian cotton for Czech arms. It was followed on October 10 by Soviet announcement that it was ready to give the Arab countries any help they needed "to carry out economic development projects." The years from 1953 to the end of 1955 had marked a concentrated effort by the Soviet Union to break into the Mideast. Finally, when the agitation of the Arab countries against the Baghdad Pact was at its height, and when Britain had withdrawn its forces from the Suez base, pursuant to agreement with Egypt—which we had a great deal to do with bringing about—and was preoccupied with its trouble in Cyprus, the Soviet bloc struck, in the diplomatic sense, by the arms deal with Egypt. The culmination of this phase of intensive Soviet effort at infiltration and disruption was realized on July 26, 1956, when Egypt assumed full control of Suez Canal operations and seized the assets of the Suez Canal Co. It is the crisis set in motion by the Suez seizure by Egypt which we have since been in the process of liquidating.

In short, the present grave threat in the Mideast is not alone the result of action of the Middle East countries, but a result of the Soviet Union's activities which have aggravated the problems in the Mideast countries. Therefore any measure by the United States setting forth to meet the dangerous Soviet policies in the Middle East, is urgent in character for the United States.

Under these circumstances it is important to note the size and consequence of the military aspects of the Mideast Resolution which is before the Senate. It has been the pattern of operation of the Communist bloc, particularly in underdeveloped areas, to induce internal subversion by external aggression and coercion, either direct or indirect. This was certainly the pattern in Indochina. It was tried and failed against Burma,

and it was the pattern in Korea. Going back in history it was the pattern used on Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, and Bulgaria. Hence, the military phases of this resolution, by serving notice upon the Communist bloc that aggression or coercion by armed forces will produce an immediate reaction from us, would be insulating the area against the most direct threat of hostility which exists in it. With the states in the Mideast knowing that the Communist bloc cannot intervene by force directly or indirectly, or through "volunteers," without involving United States counterforce, we restore our capability of dealing with the situation in the Mideast on the basis of the states and problems indigenous to the region.

This does not mean that the Soviets will not try to have their hand in every situation, but so long as they cannot use force without meeting similar force from us, we deprive them of the great advantage which they have in international affairs in tense areas; the advantage of being able to order secretly the use of force or to disguise its use through "volunteers" or by some other means which are not available to a free nation like our own. The adoption of this resolution, therefore, becomes a condition precedent to doing anything really effective with respect to the problems in the area, notably the Arab-Israel conflict.

The real point about this resolution is the advance notice which it serves on the Soviet bloc. I repeat that statement. The real point of the resolution is the advance notice which it serves on the Soviet bloc. Surely, many Members have said, and we all understand, that Congress can declare war; but who wants that? This resolution is a new technique in the effort to prevent war. That is what we must understand about it. This technique began with the Formosa Resolution.

In the Formosa Resolution we served notice that, at the invitation of our friends, we would react to force by the use of force. In this particular case we serve notice that, if invited, we will exert force against force. This is a different type, but it is the same answer. It is a new technique in American policy. It is not a declaration of war; nor are we waiting for a situation to arise when it would be the prerogative of Congress to declare war. It is advance notice that we will combat force with force. In that respect I think it is a new technique in meeting Communist techniques which present us with a new situation, and one which the Senate should adopt.

One other point is essential. The masses of people in the Mideast outside of Israel live under such depressed economic conditions now, and so low is the standard of literacy, that psychological influences, especially as expressed through its popular leaders, like Colonel Nasser, have a disproportionate effect compared with the situation in our own generally literate society. One of the basic aspects of this psychology is the desire on the part of both the leadership and the masses to be with the winner. By decisively ruling out the possibility

of Soviet intervention with force in the Mideast and exercising, upon the highest level, authority which indicates our determination not to be on the losing side in this area, we speak in language which is unmistakable and understandable to the masses as well as to their leaders and realize an important gain, already.

It has been said that the resolution settles nothing, and that the major conflict in the Mideast area, the Arab-Israel struggle, remains unaffected by it. The essential purpose of the Mideast Resolution is well-stated on page 5 of the committee report:

But the authority granted by this resolution is essential to provide an atmosphere in which other measures can be brought to bear, and to provide time for those other measures to be effective.

To effectively implement this resolution and to take advantage of the time opportunity which it gives to us, it will be essential for our Government to develop an effective policy to settle the Arab-Israel conflict. It is already apparent that this conflict cannot be dealt with solely within the United Nations, as the United Nations does not have adequate powers or forces for the purpose.

I should like to take a few minutes to address myself to what must be an effort to resolve that conflict.

Extremely desirable as it is to bring about recognition by the Arab States that Israel exists, and peace negotiations with Israel, and vital as this is not only to the peace but to the development of the whole area, I deeply feel—and I have been there recently—it does not seem attainable under present circumstances. What we need to do, therefore, is to assure Israel of its essential rights as a state, while at one and the same time we adopt policies which will be most conducive to stability of the area and offer the best chance for ultimate peace.

The first priority in this would appear to me to require accounting of Egypt's responsibility to the free world; for too long Colonel Nasser and his predecessor, General Naguib, have been allowed to evade such responsibility. This responsibility includes guaranties for international transit, including the ships of Great Britain, France, and Israel, through the Suez Canal in compliance with the six principles adopted by the United Nations Security Council on October 1956—principles in which Egypt concurred—assurance of transit of international shipping, including the ships of Israel, for peaceful commerce through all international waterways in which Egypt has any part, including both the Gulf of Aqaba and the Suez Canal. It also requires cessation of violations of the armistice agreement with Israel, negotiated in 1949 under United Nations auspices. Further, it requires the cessation of governmental organization of guerrilla raids, largely from Egypt, upon the territory of Israel.

It requires also—and in this, too, the free world has a vital interest—the cessation of Egypt's agitation throughout north and central Africa; indeed, through all the Moslem countries against the free world, with Egypt acting, in effect, as a tool of the Communists.



Finally, it requires Egypt to quit blocking the resettlement of the Palestine-Arab refugees. There are grounds for optimism—and to me this is perhaps the most significant of recent developments—that our Government is now beginning to recognize the need for calling Egypt to task as to its international responsibilities, and is preparing to do it. No less than clearance of the Suez Canal and an end to Egypt-Israel hostilities wait on it.

The "fedayeen" or guerrilla raids, openly backed and organized by Egypt in the Gaza Strip and in the Sinai Desert, represent a clear violation of the armistice agreement with Israel, negotiated in 1949 under U. N. auspices. With the armistice agreement violated a vacuum is created which calls for administration of the Gaza Strip by the United Nations in the absence of some new agreement between Israel and Egypt. Also, I believe our Government should spell out such raids as being contrary to the guarantees of the three-power declaration of May 1950, entered into by the United States, the United Kingdom, and France, which guaranteed the armistice borders between Israel and the Arab States.

I point out that there is adequate precedent for calling upon the United Nations to administer the Gaza Strip, and perhaps, as a first step, sending a United Nations commission there to ascertain exactly what will be the situation when Israel's forces withdraw and the United Nations emergency force steps in.

A similar situation existed in the case of Libya. Under the Italian peace treaty of 1947, Italy renounced all claim to her former colony, Libya. Its fate, according to that peace treaty, was to be determined within one year, that is, by 1948, by the United States, Britain, France, and Russia. When those four failed to agree upon a solution, as they did, the United States took the problem before the United Nations in 1949, and that organization handled it completely from then on, and, indeed, brought about the independence of Libya.

I respectfully submit that that is almost an exact precedent for a situation in which an armistice agreement, negotiated under United Nations auspices, has broken down, leaving a vacuum, which should now be filled by United Nations administration. The first step is the appointment of a United Nations Commission to ascertain just what the United Nations ought to do, and how it ought to handle the problem.

I spoke of action outside the United Nations. It seems to me that we have many areas for action which could be very helpful. For example, we should offer to join, at the request of the U. N., in a naval patrol to secure freedom of international shipping through the Gulf of Aqaba. That is the Canadian proposal, put forward by Lester Pearson, Canada's delegate to the United Nations. Also, we should offer to aid the U. N. in establishing its civil administration in the Gaza Strip. It may require money. It may require some logistical support, in the way of shipping. All these things we have made available in the past to facilitate United Nations action; and it certainly

is desirable that a similar course be followed in this instance.

Finally, upon withdrawal of Israel's forces, we should support the entry into the Sharm-el-Sheikh area bordering the Gulf of Aqaba and into the Gaza Strip of the United Nations Emergency Force, to remain there until the U. N. mission, the maintenance of peace, is accomplished, and the forces of Israel should accordingly withdraw.

Everyone agrees that the United Nations Emergency Force ought to step in when the Israeli forces move out; and there is a pretty grave question as to whether they should remain there until their mission is accomplished—namely, pacification of the area—or whether they are subject to being ousted whenever Egypt says they should go.

It seems to me that we ought to support the idea of the United Nations force remaining until such time as its mission is accomplished. If the United Nations is to deal with international brigandage and violations of international agreements, it will have to do so on someone's territory. Every piece of the world, for practical purposes, is owned by someone. So we had better make the determination now, that when the United Nations acts under the charter with the necessary authority it is acting in behalf of the people of the world. Therefore, to that extent, in the maintenance of international peace there must be some understanding of rights on the part of particular people in a particular country being recognized within the context of the right of the world to maintain peace. Such actions require United Nations resolutions.

Here I come to a very critical phase of the situation. Only yesterday we were told by the press that the Ambassador of Israel had conferred with the Secretary General of the United Nations presumably about U. N. resolutions dealing with Aqaba and Gaza. I suppose the question will be asked, "Suppose the resolution does not pass. What then?" Then the situation will be stalemated, while negotiations continue under the impasse. Such a stalemate is certainly to be preferred over the imposition of sanctions on Israel, sanctions which, it seems to me pretty clearly, now are unpopular in the United States, and, indeed, in the United Nations, as tending to make the United Nations an instrument of one-sided action. Indeed, Mr. President, it seems to me that sufficient progress has been made by now so that perhaps our Secretary of State could say that negotiations have proceeded to the point where sanctions are no longer being considered and thereby clear the air even further.

Mr. President, we must get over the idea that the United Nations can do everything, or that we must always be lined up with a two-thirds majority there, right or wrong. We need not help make the two-thirds majority and should in fact oppose it if we feel action is wrong. Where the United Nations is frustrated by the veto or has not the powers or means to act it is necessary for us to act outside the United Nations, at least in part, as the Mideast Resolution

itself shows. On occasion no action by the United Nations is better than action which is wrong or damaging to the United Nations and to the prospects for peace. Members of the United Nations are bound only according to their Charter obligations and by lawful United Nations actions, not by United Nations inaction or inability to act.

Mr. President, at this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks, a document entitled "United States Foreign Policy and the United Nations." It is a draft study prepared at my request, and shows three alternative situations.

It shows cases in which we have acted outside the United Nations, cases involving international affairs in which we have acted partially within the United Nations and cases where we have acted completely within the United Nations. This study shows that at this stage in the development of our international policies, all three alternatives are essential to the maintenance and the pursuit of our policy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, another one of the very grave problems which we face in the Middle East area is the resettlement of the Palestine-Arab refugees. More than 900,000 are on the rolls of the United Nations Relief and Works Agency, financed to the extent of 90 percent of the necessary budget by the United States and Great Britain. Of the total number, it is estimated that only about two-thirds, or 600,000, are truly Palestine-Arab refugees in the sense that their original homes were in the area which is now Israel.

I had the privilege of seeing one of the large refugee camps outside Gaza only 2 months ago. About one-third of the refugees are located in the Gaza Strip, and the remainder are primarily in Jordan.

Subject to U. N. administration, it should be possible to induce Palestine-Arab refugees in the Gaza Strip to seek resettlement, for the major barrier toward such resettlement has been the intransigence of the Arab host governments and their propaganda directed toward the refugees, urging them not to be resettled.

Indeed, Mr. President, some of the nations in the Middle East themselves have enormous capacity from the standpoint of resettlement. For example, Iraq, in the Tigris and Euphrates Valleys, has a tremendous potential in that respect.

Once the way is cleared for the United Nations in the Gaza Strip, it could undertake to break the logjam by seeking resettlement projects through agreements with nations having the capacity to absorb immigrants. That is the same plan which worked satisfactorily in resettling the displaced persons in Europe beginning in 1948. The U. N. resolution passed Friday last already contemplates such independent U. N. activity to resettle the Palestine-Arab refugees. In that way, at long last, it would be possible to resettle

the unhappy and unfortunate Arab-Palestine refugees.

Also the U. N. could then open negotiations with Israel for compensation to these Palestine-Arab refugees for property left in Israel, and for some repatriation within Israel for those of them who sincerely wish it, with due and careful consideration to the requirements of Israel's security and the reuniting of families. I might say in this connection that the Government of Israel has already shown its receptivity to that kind of negotiation.

There is also involved in the compensation question consideration for the losses sustained by those of Jewish faith who emigrated to Israel following their expulsion by Arab States, including Egypt, Iran, and Yemen, and the persecution they endured, including the appropriation of their property there without any compensation.

An essential element of our Mideast policy is what we are to do about economic and technical assistance programs for the whole Middle East, and how we can best bring to bear our resources in a peaceful way as an element of our policy of seeking area stability and peace.

I have noted three major arguments which have been made against the adoption of the joint resolution. The first is that a number of the countries of the Middle East have very large resources which they obtain from their oil revenues, and therefore they ought to take care of their own economic and technical assistance programs.

The second is that there is no specific plan contained in the joint resolution for the spending of the \$200 million, or exactly how we are going to spend the money.

The third argument is that perhaps the aid will not be accepted by many of the Arab countries of the Middle East, and therefore will be of no use.

I should like to deal with each of these arguments. I may say, incidentally, that I am not new to this subject, as I served as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs in the House of Representatives for 8 years during the formative years of both the Marshall plan and the mutual-security program. I have had considerable experience with these questions, which have been debated before with respect to this and other areas of the world.

First, as to whether the nations of the Middle East will accept the aid that is offered to them. I think that question refers to the fundamental principle involved and to the fundamental question of American policy in the Middle East. I believe that policy ought to be to keep the door open to all nations for participation in economic and technical assistance efforts, and that we should not deny any aid to any other State because other nations refuse to accept it or resist terms for their participation.

This, of course, applies to Israel. As we know, there have been refusals in the Mideast to accept our aid by nations who stated that because they refused aid, it automatically meant a veto on giving aid to any other nation in the

Middle East, and therefore Israel should not receive aid either.

The aid which we give should be designed, as is true in the Middle East Resolution, on a regional basis, and we should contemplate constantly maximum joint action among the nations affected. The United States cannot always contemplate the fact that this area will remain unsettled and divided. On the contrary, we must look forward and beyond the present difficulties to our ultimate objective.

The aid which we give should be directed toward the maximum joint action among the nations affected. Such joint action is entirely practicable in the fields of irrigation and flood control, highways, regional development banks, power systems, education, public health, communications, immigration, and customs control. Aid should be programed in each country with a view toward integrating individual country plans into a regional plan for the rest of the area at such time as additional Arab States may join. In this process, too, there should be employed the multilateral technical assistance activities of the United Nations whenever advisable.

In that respect I might say that we have an automatic regulator with respect to how much multilateral technical assistance there should be through the U. N., because we are the main support of that activity, and it depends on our appropriations as to how large or how small it shall be.

Our appropriations amount to about \$17 million, in round figures, and we spend about 8 to 9 times that amount on our own technical assistance programs; so there is no great danger that the United Nations technical assistance program will run away with the ball. We must have faith enough to believe that men with full stomachs will choose the freedom road. If we are to believe that men, given a free choice, will choose the Communist road, then we are in a bad way, indeed. Therefore, Mr. President, much as I appreciate, together with my colleagues, the pleasure of seeing the tag "Made in the U. S. A.," on everything we do in the form of foreign aid, I do not believe it is not nearly so vital as doing the job in terms of getting results in the form of peace and stability and free choice on the part of people.

Examples of this cooperative approach, or keeping the door open to it, which is what I feel is the only thing we can do and what we should and must do with our economic and technical assistance, are found in the Nile River Dam project which too many people have forgotten as being a cooperative project with the Sudan and not solely a project of Egypt itself. It seems to me that at every stage we must keep all the pipelines, the ends of the road, the ends of the project, the planning for the project, always open. Though at the moment it may be necessary to have a program apply to one country in order to do the maximum job possible in that country, it must always be with the idea, in a decade or two, of extending what is done in one area to the rest of the region. For this, Mr. President, is a region. It has got to

be treated as a region. That is true of Israel as well as of every Arab State. I think some Arab leaders are giving their people the most misguided and misleading information that has ever been given to them in preaching the end of Israel.

The impact upon the chronically depressed Arab countries of modern, productive, and fruitful Israel, with a vital and functioning representative government controlled by the people under free institutions like our own must not be underestimated. Ultimately, Israel's achievements in the utilization of natural resources, in agricultural and in urban development, education, health, communications, and science will prove to be a model for the Arab world and the decisive factor in the modernization of the Near East and the defeat of the Communist threat to it. Therefore, Mr. President, Israel represents a pilot plant of what we are trying to do in terms of economic development in the entire area.

Mr. President, I now wish to take up another of the objections, and that is the objection that an Arab country with oil resources, like Saudi Arabia, should do its own developing. It is true that some Arab nations have large revenues from oil, and it is also true that often only small amounts of those revenues are spent for education and reconstruction purposes. These are the facts of life; and if we could afford to wait decades until such time as the situation were changed and improved by the internal determination of the people themselves, that would be a very fine idea. But we cannot wait, because we are not alone in the world. We have a big, tough, mean, and often angry, duplicitous, and constantly cunning competitor who challenges us at every step, who is delighted to let people of the Mideast area remain benighted because some governments will not look after their own. The Soviets are trying to accomplish the communization of the world. Therefore, we cannot wait. We must ourselves encourage projects in Saudi Arabia and in other countries by being willing to put up some seed money. We are trying to arouse a demand on the part of the people in those countries and bring about, sooner or later, the development of those countries which is so essential to—whose security? To our security. We are the most productive of the free nations. We are looking after our own security which is decisively linked with the security of the whole free world.

The reason why there are no specific projects today, the reason we are talking about \$200 million instead of \$2 billion—which is what it would take to complete some of these development jobs in those areas of the world—is so we can go forth with money and put it to the best use, because it can be used for the purpose of encouraging others to spend their money and arousing a public appetite for achievement not only by us, but by them in their own country.

Mr. President, that is the fundamental basis which underlies the question. I am rather interested that on the part of some of the strongest opponents of this particular phase of the resolution there is not some recognition of the fact that



we have to proceed—within the constitutional limits of our society—and not tell the other side everything we are going to do in the greatest detail.

I was deeply interested in the fact that my very distinguished friend, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] for whom I have great admiration and respect, placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD yesterday an article by George Sokolsky of which he approved. He said it looked to him like a fine exposition of an important idea. The article begins with the following statement:

Soviet Russia has only one advantage over the United States and it is a tremendous one. The Russians can formulate a program of action based on a design for achievement and can put behind it all the resources of government. This the United States has not been able to do since John Hay was Secretary of State.

In other words, Mr. President, we have to find some way within our constitutional framework to give ourselves some of the advantages of not telegraphing every punch we are going to throw. The only way we can do it sometimes is by limiting what the Executive can spend, as we are doing here, to \$200 million, and giving the Executive the opportunity to spend it in the way in which it will do the most good.

A tremendous opportunity exists in this Mideast area in the utilization of private United States business, trade associations, professional, missionary, veterans and civic organizations, as well as institutions of learning, for the interchange of ideas and for the extension of their activities on an international basis, through the Middle East. This can result in the interchange of ideas and experience and the development of codes of good practice and conduct. Beginnings have already been made in the activities of certain professional engineering societies in some Middle East countries and in the activities of the International Bar Association, but the surface has hardly been scratched. In our aid programs, and bearing in mind the low living standards which we are seeking to raise, and the medieval society which we are seeking to affect, our aid should be on the simple level, touching the daily lives of the people, increasing their individual productivity, and relieving them of immediate hardships. This is the case to begin with.

My wife and I visited India only 2 months ago and saw with the deepest interest the so-called village-development program there, which is on a village level in the most elementary terms of a sheet-iron stovepipe to take out of a home the odor which is caused by cooking on a small, open fire. Little things like that are coming directly home to the people in the villages and are helping to transform the lives of the people right at their own fireside.

We should be wary of additional capital in the hands of leaders in some countries not yet concerned with social justice in the use of national resources, both public and private, as additional capital employed in this way in major projects may only widen the gulf between the very rich and the very poor, since there

is no middle class, by and large, in the great majority of the Mideast countries.

So, in developing our projects, I suggest, as word of caution and advice, that an effort should be made to develop projects which are the closest and most dear to the individual family and the individual village.

Finally, in dealing with the Middle East, we need to have clearly defined our understanding of the governmental situation in extending aid and operating under the resolution. Turkey, Iran, Iraq, Syria, Lebanon, and Egypt have basic governmental organizations and specialized functional agencies needed to correlate with our programs for economic and social development. Egypt, however, although it is equipped with such a basic governmental organization, now finds its Government in the hands of Colonel Nasser and his group, who exploit, as they have quite clearly shown, anything done with them for the purposes of their own power, and xenophobia at the very least, and on occasion as Communist tools, as well, as we have already seen from experience.

We are, in the Middle East, in an area of great conflict with regard to self-determination by peoples in various stages of nationhood. This aspect has some fundamental principles which need to be laid down, and which require our attention.

For one, the responsibility in the United Nations to maintain international peace must be considered as paramount. I expressed my views on that point a little while ago, in reference to the right of the United Nations to endeavor to maintain peace although it may affect the individual territory of any particular members.

Thus in the situation between Egypt and Israel, where the fomenting by Egypt of fedayeen raids was a direct cause of the outbreak of hostilities on October 29, 1956, the obligation existed on the part of the United Nations once it stepped into the situation to suppress this brigandage. Obviously, an event of this kind can only take place on the territory of someone. Accepting, therefore, a self-imposed condition that the United Nations Emergency Force could only remain in Egypt with Egypt's permission, was accepting a control of the United Nations efforts for the maintenance of international peace which threatened constantly to completely defeat it, and weakened and debilitated it at every stage.

Second, the right of self-determination which we honor so rightly must nevertheless exist within the context of other rights pertaining to other peoples. It does not stand alone. Also, it carries responsibilities implicit in the concept of nationhood, and these require a people who would attain nationhood to insure political, social, and economic viability in a modern world and to guarantee freedom from subjugation of its people to communism or any other hostile ism, as well as the ability to maintain free institutions among them.

These are inalienable rights, which must be dealt with in the context also of the other inalienable rights of man-

kind. These are the rights of peace and freedom, which all mankind must enjoy.

Our concept of our foreign policy leadership and responsibility is certainly maturing, and the pending resolution marks the further development and maturity of it. In the Formosa resolution, which preceded it, we responded to an urgent call from a close friend and valued ally whose security was imminently threatened. In the Mideast resolution we see chaotic and incendiary situation imminently dangerous to international peace, and we offer our resources and our leadership for the solution of the problem at one and the same time that we serve notice that we will not tolerate the subjugation of a region by force and coercion or infiltration, so far as the Communist bloc is concerned. Our devotion to the United Nations and our operations within the United Nations context, subject to our charter obligations, complete the developing concept of United States foreign policy leadership. The emphasis now needs to be upon the affirmative in resolving practical questions like Agaba and Gaza, like those which we now face in endeavoring to resolve the Egypt-Israel difficulty; and in mounting our own offensive against communism essentially by the exercise of our productive power and technical genius, and the expression of our moral ideology and belief in human dignity and freedom. The Middle East resolution opens this road to us in the critical and strategic Middle East region.

Mr. President, I think the Middle East resolution represents a step along the road to responsibility and maturity of leadership on the part of the United States. What is made of it will depend not only upon the President of the United States and his Cabinet officers; it will depend also upon the Members of the Senate, and upon our taking advantage of the opportunities which the resolution affords us to have some influence constructively upon the foreign policy of our country. The same is true of our great sister body, having equal powers, at the other end of the Capitol.

In short, Mr. President, the United States is growing up and is establishing and accepting a responsibility which is compatible with our power in the world. This is a good thing. It requires somewhat more flexibility and somewhat less restraint from the exact and precise rules and regulations in which we have heretofore allowed ourselves to indulge.

But, Mr. President, this responsibility is demanded of us, not by any ideas we have as to how great or how wise we are, but by the intense, the grim, the mortal competition which we face from the Soviet Union.

In all the arguments and discussions, let us not forget that there is only one end and aim of the Soviet Union, namely, the subjugation and the destruction of every value we hold dear. No matter how many smiles there are to disguise it, that is the fundamental proposition. Hence, the competition with the Soviet Union is real and final. So we must act in a spirit of awareness if we are to be effective, if we are to serve. That is the mission for which I deeply believe the Lord put us on earth.

## EXHIBIT 1

## UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY AND THE UNITED NATIONS

This paper examines the use which the United States has made of the United Nations in attaining the objectives of its foreign policy. The United Nations is in essence a permanent conference of the nation states who are its members. As such its powers are basically those of an international conference, that is, action by the U. N. can only be accomplished by the power of the states that compose it. In some instances the United States has made no use of the instrumentality of the U. N., but has exerted its power and influence entirely through alternative channels of diplomacy. In other instances we have used the U. N. in conjunction with these other channels. Finally, there have been a few problems where the United States has found that the exclusive use of the U. N. offered the best possibility of successfully attaining our policy goals.

At tab A is a discussion of those cases in which no use has been made of the United Nations. In general these are cases involving regional security in Europe or southeast Asia. The U. N. is by nature not designed to deal with problems of regional security. Both NATO and SEATO are primarily meant to deter or meet Soviet aggression thus making it impossible for them to come within an organization like the U. N. which includes the potential enemy. The wars in China and Indochina were also dealt with exclusively outside the U. N. as they were matters of domestic jurisdiction and there seemed no desire on the part of even China and France to involve the U. N. in the situations.

Instances when the United States has utilized the services of the U. N. in addition to other means are discussed at Tab B. These include such cases as the fate of Trieste, Indonesia, the Berlin blockade, the Greek border incidents, the presence of Soviet troops in Iran, and the attack on the Republic of Korea. In some of these cases the United States utilized the U. N. in a merely perfunctory way while in others the bulk of United States energies were exerted under the sanction of U. N. resolutions and recommendations. Sometimes the role of the U. N. was to make known to the world the reality and extent of Soviet-bloc guilt for the threat to the peace. In others, the U. N. provided a means of settling a difficult problem within the free world in a way that prevented an extension of Soviet power into the area. In the case of Korea, the U. N. was used to establish objectively the fact of Communist aggression, to give international sanction to the military response of the United States and increase the number of nations supporting our fighting forces in a material fashion.

There have been a very few problems in world politics since the end of World War II that the United States has sought to resolve almost exclusively through the use of the United Nations. Those that seem to fall into this category are discussed at Tab C. They include the independence of Libya and Palestine, and the problems concerned with the control or reduction of armaments. Each of these situations has been so different it is impossible to generalize upon them in this introduction, except to say that at the time the United States Government of the day apparently felt that American interests could be more thoroughly realized by use of the U. N. than by any other possible diplomatic means.

The results of this study indicate clearly that the United States has made substantial use of the United Nations as an instrument through which to realize its foreign policy goals. However, it has never felt itself restricted to using only the U. N. When United States interests could not be served

by use of this general international organization it was not used at all. In each situation it has been necessary to decide if the nature of the U. N., its current membership, the nature of the problem, and so forth, were such that it would be worthwhile to exert our influence through the U. N. in attempting to resolve the question. When the circumstances that made the U. N. highly useful in handling a particular problem at one stage of its development have significantly changed, then it would clearly not be logical for the United States to continue to seek the solution of that particular problem exclusively through the U. N.

## A. MAJOR UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY PROBLEMS DEALT WITH LARGELY OUTSIDE THE UNITED NATIONS

The United Nations has not been found significant in assisting the United States in the attainment of its policy goals with reference to developing adequate economic and military security in Europe and Asia or in dealing with the war in Indochina or the Communist takeover of power in China.

After the great damage wrought by World War II, extensive economic assistance was necessary if Western Europe was to again become economically viable. The United Nations did not possess the funds necessary to do this. But almost from the beginning of the United States aid programs to Europe there was the second aspect of building the military defenses of the countries against possible Soviet aggression. When tension between Russia and the United States increased, economic aid to Europe became important in preventing Communist subversion and political victory at the polls. The North Atlantic Treaty and the program of military aid to Europe were of the utmost importance to the United States. They had nothing to do with the United Nations, despite the fact that NATO was justified under the terms of article 51 of the United Nations Charter.

It would not have been possible to accomplish through the U. N. the goals of rebuilding Europe economically and militarily to meet the threats of Communist subversion and overt aggression by the Soviet Union. The U. N. lacked the massive economic resources that were required. But more importantly, the U. N. contained the potential enemy, the Soviet Union. She would hardly have facilitated the development of West European internal strength against Communist subversion. It was hardly possible to make the U. N. a defensive military alliance of some members against an attack by other members of the same alliance. Also, an effective alliance required closer cooperation and integration of planning and armed forces than would be possible through a loose, general, almost worldwide organization like the U. N. Thus, the United Nations was irrelevant here by virtue of its very nature, its lack of resources, and inappropriateness of the members that composed it.

For much the same reasons the U. N. has been of no significance in developing military security in southeast Asia. The development of military security in that area is considered an extremely divisive program by many of the nations in the area. Thus it would not even have been possible to obtain a Security Council or General Assembly recommendation in favor of the formation of something like the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization. Many of the states in that part of the world seek to avoid allying themselves with either the United States or the Soviet Union for a variety of reasons. Again, of course, at least one of the potential enemies, Russia, was included in the United Nations and the representatives of the other, Communist China, were knocking at the door seeking to have their representative seated. Russia has called both NATO and SEATO threats to world peace and signs of United States imperialism around the world. SEATO, which is, of course, much looser and

less fully developed than NATO, is also supplemented by many unilateral United States commitments of military and other forms of aid to the member states.

The control of the Nationalist Government of China over the Chinese mainland was gradually whittled away until it now exercises sovereignty only on the island of Taiwan (Formosa). This matter was not considered by the United Nations. To the extent that the United States was able to fortify the Nationalist Government in its fight against the Communists the United States chose to do so by direct military aid and other forms of assistance. The United Nations is not designed to deal with internal problems such as a civil war. The change of government in China has come before the U. N. primarily in the form of a contest between the two governments for China's seat in the United Nations. The United States and some other members have sought to prevent the organization from accepting the credentials of the representatives of the Communist government.

The United Nations played no role in the long war which France waged against the independence movement in Indochina. This was a problem for United States foreign policy because of our desire to prevent the spread of Communist control in the world and our reluctance to oppose independence movements. France bore the problem alone except for extensive United States military and economic aid directly to France which she was able to divert to support her forces fighting in Indochina. Again, this was treated as an internal question which logically could not come before the United Nations.

## B. MAJOR UNITED STATES FOREIGN-POLICY PROBLEMS DEALT WITH BOTH THROUGH THE U. N. AND OTHER DIPLOMATIC MEANS

There have been a number of instances since 1945 when the United States has felt its foreign-policy objectives could best be realized by using a combination of several resources of diplomacy, including the United Nations. In some cases the U. N. was the major channel utilized and only supplemented in part by other means. In others, the U. N. was used less significantly. The following are included here: The Trieste problem, Indonesian independence, the Berlin blockade, the Greek border incidents, the presence of Soviet troops in Iran, and the invasion of the Republic of Korea.

The free territory of Trieste was created by the Italian Peace Treaty of 1947. It was to be under the special protection of the United Nations Security Council, which was also supposed to name a governor for the territory. Great power differences prevented the Council from even naming a governor for this tense area claimed by Italy and Yugoslavia. This would have helped settle the problem and perhaps hurt Yugoslavia's chances to gain additional sections of Trieste. Early in 1948, prior to the Italian elections and the defection of Yugoslavia from the Soviet bloc, the United States, Britain, and France declared all the territory should be returned to Italy and the peace treaty so amended. The U. N. ceased to play any role in the issue. After Yugoslavia's defection from the Soviet bloc the problem became essentially one within the free world which the United States therefore sought to settle on its merits and in a manner that would be least upsetting to good Italo-Yugoslavian relations. The United States then urged direct negotiations between the two contestants and finally an agreement was reached in 1954. Thus, the role of the U. N. in the Trieste case was perfunctory. At first the United States sought to use it to keep more of Trieste from falling under Soviet (Yugoslav) control and later worked for direct negotiations to settle the issue when it was clear the U. N. would



not be useful in achieving a worthwhile settlement.

In the Indonesian situation the United Nations served magnificently as a means of resolving a difficult problem within the free world that was a problem for the United States because of the great power role it played. The essential job of the U. N. here was to provide an acceptable third party to usher the Republic of Indonesia (1949) into inevitable independence without increasing Soviet influence there as the Dutch power was withdrawn. In this situation the U. N. was useful in its own right as a mediator and a means of providing some pressure on the Netherlands to agree to Indonesian independence. The United States faced something of a dilemma because the Netherlands was our ally in the Marshall Plan and at the same time the United States wanted to win the approval of the Asian nations. The United States sought the independence of Indonesia outside the U. N. as well as inside the organization. One of the decisive factors in final Dutch agreement was the withdrawal of United States Marshall plan aid that was slated to be used in Indonesia. Without United States pressure on the Netherlands it is dubious whether the U. N. would have been successful. Without the U. N., it would have been much more difficult to pacify the situation and hammer out a workable agreement at the same time preventing the active intervention of the Soviet Union.

The Berlin blockade, however, is another instance in which the role of the U. N. was only formal and did not contribute to the substantive solution of the problem. When in 1948 the U. S. S. R. refused to permit trucks and trains to pass through her part of Germany in order to reach Berlin, the United States responded with the airlift that kept the city of Berlin supplied with the basic necessities. The Soviet Union vetoed a Security Council resolution that the blockade should be lifted coincident with a settlement of a related currency problem in Berlin. Later the United States delegate, Mr. Philip Jessup, and the Soviet delegate, Mr. Jacob Malik, met in the corridors of the U. N. and more or less agreed on a settlement that had been hinted at earlier in the Soviet press. Thus, the U. N. helped focus world attention on the issue, provided the physical setting for an agreement and the daily availability of the diplomats concerned. But the U. N. did not in any way settle the problem itself. The U. S. S. R. had created a situation by which it hoped to force the United States and the other Western Powers to withdraw from Berlin. The only alternative seemed to be for the West to accept the consequences of starting a general European war to preserve their stake in Germany. The Berlin airlift provided a solution that evaded either alternative and made it necessary for the Soviet Union either to back down or itself start the big war to force back Western power in Germany. Russia ended the blockade. Thus, the U. N. played a significant, if small role.

In the case of the Greek border incidents (1946-48) the United States sought to prevent the conquest of the Greek Government by Communist guerrilla forces supported by Yugoslavia, Albania, and Bulgaria. The major factors in accomplishing this goal were the Truman doctrine of United States aid to Greece, the stationing of the United States Sixth Fleet in close proximity to Greece, the defection of Yugoslavia from the Soviet bloc, and the role played by the United Nations. Undoubtedly, a Communist takeover could have been prevented without the participation of the U. N., but the international organization served the purposes of providing internationally acceptable objective accounts of aggression from Yugoslavia and to a lesser extent from Albania and Bulgaria.

It also provided a greater measure of international support for the United States aid program to defend the Greek Government. The U. N. provided this added support because the membership of the international organization at that time was such that a clear majority could be obtained to adopt a position against the military expansion of Soviet influence in Europe.

One of the earliest cases to come before the U. N. Security Council was the complaint of Iran that Russia was interfering in her internal affairs by refusing to withdraw troops stationed there during the war. The United States, Britain, and Russia had agreed at the Teheran Conference that all troops would be withdrawn from Iran within 6 months after the end of the war. The Western Powers were vitally interested in securing the drawback of Soviet troops to preclude an increase of Soviet influence and control in the Middle East. The United States took a strong public stand in favor of the Iranian position in its complaint to the U. N. It is also reliably reported that the United States expressed itself very strongly to the U. S. S. R. in private. The Soviet troops were quickly removed from Iran. In this case the U. N. served the purpose of notifying the world of Soviet attempts to extend its position in the Middle East. This focusing of attention had some effect, but most observers agree that the vigorous response by the United States both inside and outside the U. N. was the key factor in forcing Soviet withdrawal. The Soviets did not want to have a showdown with the United States so soon after the end of World War II.

The invasion of the Republic of Korea is the final and perhaps most important instance to be noted in which the United States pursued the goals of its foreign policy concurrently within and outside the United Nations. Here was the first example of an attempt to extend Chinese-Russian domination by overt armed aggression. It was thus a direct challenge to the United States foreign policy of containing communism. Unless the United States acted decisively here, it would be apparent to the rest of the Asian nations that they could not depend on the United States for real security in case of armed attack. It was also a direct challenge to the authority of the United Nations which had had special responsibilities since 1947 for the establishment of a democratic government in Korea.

The United States supplied large contingents of Armed Forces and material to repel the attack by the North Korean Communist Government. This was the essential basis for the degree of victory that was achieved in Korea under the U. N. But beyond this, it was vital to the United States that it be made clear this was not another instance of western imperialism in Asia. It was particularly important to have the support of other Asian governments. The United Nations provided these other requirements. The U. N. observation team was able to establish the objective fact of North Korean aggression on South Korea. The wide support in the U. N. for sending aid to the Republic of Korea gave a firm international if not disinterested character to the United States military assistance. This made it clear the United States action was merely to aid a nation that had been attacked and that it was not western imperialism. Thus, in this case, the U. N. was a vital channel through which the United States attained its foreign policy goal. But, of course, it was primarily the power of the United States and not the nonexistent power of the U. N. itself that halted the aggression.

#### C. INSTANCES IN WHICH THE UNITED STATES HAS USED THE U. N. ALMOST EXCLUSIVELY AS THE MEANS OF CARRYING OUT ITS FOREIGN POLICY

There are, of course, no instances where the U. N. by its own power effectuated the pacification of an international threat to the

peace. The only power possessed by the U. N. is that of its member states who may or may not choose to exert it through the U. N. or in support of the resolutions and recommendations of that organization. Thus, it would be well nigh impossible to find a case in which the goals of United States foreign policy were achieved merely by giving the problem to the United Nations and then sitting back. But there are at least three significant cases where the United States used the U. N. almost exclusively as the agency through which American influence and power was exerted. These are: independence for Libya and Israel, and the discussion of disarmament and the control of arms.

Under the Italian Peace Treaty of 1917 Italy renounced all claim to her former colony, Libya. Its fate was to be determined within 1 year by the United States, Britain, France, and Russia. When the four failed to agree on a solution, the United States took the problem before the U. N. in 1949 and that organization handled it completely from then on. The General Assembly decided Libya should become an independent state by January 1, 1952. A U. N. commission advised by a council of 10 which included the United States, but not Russia, made the necessary preparations. As a result the Soviet Union was unable to gain an entering wedge in that country, the United States airbase at Tripoli was preserved, and Libya remained firmly in the Western camp. The effect of the United States relying completely on the instrumentality of the U. N., after the initial four-power negotiations had broken down, was to achieve the United States goal of preventing a Soviet advance here. The U. N. was the perfect instrument for this because it could make Libya an independent nation and thus keep it within the free world. Without using the U. N. here it is not unlikely Libya would have become another instance of divided great power administration, for Russia might have insisted on taking part in the absence of a settlement.

The Palestine situation is one that the United States has up to now handled almost exclusively through the U. N., though the real decision in Palestine was rendered by the effectiveness of the Jewish fighting groups that carved out the State of Israel. There were two problems involved for United States foreign policy here. The first was how to settle this thorny dispute among members of the non-Communist world in a way that would be least damaging to our general position vis-a-vis the Middle Eastern countries, while at the same time seeking to realize popular desire that the oppressed Jewish people of Europe might have a homeland in Palestine. The second was that of resolving the situation in a way that prevented the intrusion of Soviet power into Palestine in the process of this withdrawal of the former British power in the mandated territory.

The United Nations apparently seemed to be a logical means to use in attacking the Palestine problem both because it was the legal successor to the League of Nations mandate and because the Arab-Jewish warfare was clearly a threat to the peace. The Palestine problem, in addition, presented the United States with a peculiar dilemma. The fact was that it was clearly impossible to devise any boundary solution for Palestine that would have satisfied both the Arab States that resented the very presence of any Jewish state and the Jewish Zionists who demanded the entire area of the Palestine mandate. Thus any boundary solution that the United States favored would alienate at least one group, if not both, to say nothing of having serious domestic political repercussions in the United States itself. Placing the problem before the U. N. would remove from the United States the onus of whatever solution was finally achieved. The

United States was pledged to support the U. N. and thus, beneath this banner, could lend its weight to the implementation of any U. N. decision that seemed fair and workable.

Another advantage to dealing with the problem through the U. N. was that whichever way the issue was decided between the two contestants, it would not involve any advance for Soviet influence in the Middle East. Thus the United States could support a decision on the merits of the case, or on whatever seemed a practical result of the combat of the two armed forces. Secondly, the Soviet Union was in favor of letting the U. N. deal with the issue, probably for the reason that it would guarantee the departure of British power from one important Middle Eastern country. The United States and its supporters in the U. N. were able to prevent the U. S. S. R. from using the device of the U. N. to increase its influence in Palestine.

One must distinguish, of course, between the Palestine situation and the present crisis in the Middle East. It was possible to utilize the services of the U. N. and this country did in the Palestine situation because, in the absence of great power conflict, membership of the organization in those years was willing to have the U. N. mediate the conflict and seek to give permanence to the solution that seemed most practical. Today, membership of the U. N. has changed significantly by the increase of a large number of states that have assumed a neutralist position in world politics. The Middle East, in addition, has become much more a center of great power conflict. It would therefore seem reasonable to suppose that the United States could not pursue a solution to the Arab-Israeli situation entirely through the U. N. with the same confidence today as it had in the earlier situation. The neutralist inclined states seem unwilling to vote against an Arab member state. Two Arab states that are dedicated to the extermination of Israel are also currently receiving extensive Soviet bloc military aid. Today, the solution of the Arab-Israeli dispute is very much bound up in the attempt of Soviet Russia to replace British and French influence in the Middle East and the consequent United States attempt to prevent this as well as defend the democratic State of Israel and maintain essential good relations with the neighboring Arab States.

The United States recognized the independent State of Israel immediately after it was proclaimed in 1948 and since then has supplied extensive public and private aid. Many commentators conclude that United States aid has been a basic factor in the continued economic well-being of Israel.

The United States has also pursued the solution to the problem of disarmament and the control and reduction of both conventional and atomic weapons almost exclusively through the U. N. This has also been the case with the Soviet Union. In this situation, the U. N. has offered the opportunity for each of the superpowers to demonstrate to the world its readiness to make agreements leading to these laudable goals and at the same time demonstrate that it is the obstructionist tactics of the other that prevent any positive accomplishments in that direction.

This is not to suggest that the United States has been insincere in its desire to lessen the dangers of atomic warfare or to halt the development of arms races. It is merely to indicate that in the presence of continuing worldwide tension between the Soviet bloc and the free world it has not been possible to make agreements that would seriously curtail their military strength. In these circumstances the U. N. provides both the arena where any possible agreements can be negotiated and the best facility for indicating to the world that the United States continues to seek a just and workable agreement.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. PAYNE. I wish to place myself on record as highly commending the excellent address which has been delivered by our colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from New York. He has set forth in very constructive form the aims, the ideals, and the objectives which the resolution seeks to accomplish. It is unfortunate that some Senators who have had questions about the exact meaning of the resolution and about the objectives of the administration and of Congress in trying to enact the resolution, were not present on the floor so that they might hear the very constructive address by the Senator from New York.

I thank the Senator from New York personally for what he has said.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from Maine.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. I desire to commend the junior Senator from New York for a most excellent address. The Senator and I served together some 10 years ago in the other body of Congress. He was advocating then the same principles he has espoused today, and he was speaking as forcefully on those occasions as he has today. I am in complete agreement with his statement that what the United States needs is a dynamic, positive foreign policy to accomplish the objectives so ably outlined by the junior Senator from New York. It is unfortunate that more Senators were not on the floor this afternoon to hear his outstanding speech.

Although no reservation could come from anything which the junior Senator from New York said in his speech, it is true that some Senators may have reservations, either unconsciously or subconsciously, stemming from the fact that we have watched the development of a strong foreign policy over the last 10 years become more ineffective in recent months. We were present when a strong policy was formulated. We have seen it made effective. We have spent billions of dollars to implement such a policy. We know that it has cost much money. But there is a growing feeling that we no longer have a dynamic, positive foreign policy. The growing tendency is to form, for the most part, military alliances, and not to achieve the splendid objectives which the junior Senator from New York has so ably outlined in his speech. That is the concern of some Senators on this side of the aisle—at least, it is of concern to me.

I am not so much concerned with the amount which is covered in the resolution. The resolution asks for a large amount of money. That disturbs some Senators on this side of the aisle; it does not disturb me one iota. But I should like to know the purpose for which the money is to be used. It is the purpose for which the money will be spent which is hidden. I do not mean that we desire to telegraph our punches; but is there a positive, intelligent foreign policy which will give some purpose and direction to the solution of the problems of the Middle East?

I do not ask the Senator from New York to answer this question. I intend to study his speech carefully tomorrow, as I hope other Senators will. But if we could achieve the aims and objectives which were outlined in his speech, there would be no question, in my mind, that that would meet the overwhelming approval of the American people. I think that is what they want to have done. But there is a hidden doubt and deep concern that there has not been nor will not be that sort of foreign policy if present practices are continued. I repeat, the junior Senator from New York has made a most excellent address, one which has been sorely needed in this debate. I am very happy to pay tribute to the junior Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I agree with the sentiments expressed by the Senator from Maine and the Senator from Colorado, who have just commended the junior Senator from New York. I think he has laid the cards on the table very clearly.

One underlying purpose of the resolution which is sought by the President is very clear, namely, to put a brake against the onslaught of the Communists from the north by any means whatsoever. Why? In the first place, 70 percent of the known supply of oil in the world is in the Middle East.

If the Communists were to take over, it is agreed—as demonstrated by recent events—that there would be a throttlehold upon our allies in Europe, and the effect upon us should be apparent to anyone who is willing to observe and who does not wear blinders.

Second, I think it is very clear that, according to the military men, if the Middle East area were taken over by the Communists, it would provide a gateway for them to Africa. Let us be frank and admit that on our own continent we have less than one-third of the materials necessary for our own defense. If the Kremlin obtained the gateway to Africa and then obtained Africa and obtained Europe, I think anyone who wishes to see can understand what the effect upon our country would be.

So I wish to thank the Senator from New York for his very thought-provoking and very logical speech, which I believe should be read by all who seek the truth.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. President, I am very grateful to my colleagues, the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL] for their kind words.

I desire to conclude with a brief word to my friend, the Senator from Colorado, with whom I enjoy serving and for whom I have great admiration. I think we should examine ourselves, too. If we feel that the foreign policy of our country does not have the inventive genius that it should have, I think some of that can be supplied by those of us who serve here. On the other hand, at times when



the foreign policy has perhaps too much inventive genius, it should be restrained. Let me give an example: It will be recalled that the United Nations essentially began from a resolution adopted in the Congress. The resultant study and development brought the United Nations into being; we proceeded on that basis, instead of proceeding on the theory that, in view of the end of the League of Nations, there was no longer a chance for an international organization.

The Senator from Colorado may recall that in respect to the Marshall plan, particularly the sections which dealt with the encouragement of private enterprise and the sections which dealt with the shipment of relief parcels—I am sure there were others, but those are the ones which occur to me at the moment—those sections were written into the bill by action of one or the other of the legislative bodies.

It will also be recalled that the so-called Kersten amendment—which was looked at askance for a time, and which purported to give the President sums of money, without strings attached, to be used for the purpose of encouraging escapees from behind the Iron Curtain—turned out to be very useful in providing a fund to be drawn on when needed for specific purposes in that connection. I think I could present quite a list of that sort. For instance, the NATO idea had its fundamental origin in the great interest in the Congress occasioned by the great pressure on Europe, both militarily and economically.

Certainly I shall never hesitate—regardless of whether the administration in power represents my party—to present ideas which seem to me to be good. Certainly all the Members of this body are very anxious to back useful, effective, and constructive ideas and proposals. Certainly all the brains capable of dealing soundly with foreign policy are not concentrated in the State Department; that is not the tradition of our country.

So I hope very much that not only from the Congress, but also from all of the great talent existing elsewhere in our country—in the universities, in the associations, in the unions, in the business organizations, and in the foundations—constructive proposals will come. I hope all our people will feel free to develop their ideas for positive dynamic action on foreign policy, and that they will be aided constructively by those of us who serve in the Congress, and who have a national, and, indeed, an international platform. As one Member of this very august body, I hope very much that I shall have the privilege of doing so, and I am sure that my colleagues will do the same.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. I have no desire to encumber the very excellent speech made by the Senator from New York by making some observations about the concern which I tried to express a short time ago.

There is no question in my mind that any administration—including the present one—deserves bipartisan support in many instances. On that point, I agree very much with the Senator from New

York, based upon our years of service in the other body. We served during the consideration of the Marshall plan and the Berlin airlift and Korean aid. As those programs proceeded step by step, we knew that the way to stem the tide of international communism was to go forward with a strong, dynamic foreign policy.

In this body, the junior Senator from New York and I are new Members. As I listened to the debate a moment ago, it seemed to me that the Senator from New York, in the course of his speech, referred to the year 1953 and to 1955, referring to events which occurred in the Middle East. I think our foreign policy in regard to that area has not been intelligent; I think it has not been constructive; I think it does not solve the basic problems which have been so ably presented to us today by the junior Senator from New York.

I agree completely with him that there are in this body and in the other body Members who are able to formulate or to participate in the formulation of the sound plans.

For example, the other day I submitted an amendment to the Foreign Relations Committee. I did so with all due humility as a new Member. The amendment was not based upon my idea; it was based upon an idea conceived by one of the great Americans to serve in this body. I refer to the late Senator Arthur Vandenberg. The idea was his, as set forth in a speech he made on the floor of the Senate in 1948. He conceived the idea of having a watchdog committee established; the words watchdog committee were his own. He wanted to have such a committee protect the taxpayers of the Nation, inasmuch as we were then about to embark upon a great program of spending billions of dollars to aid Europe.

Without trying to recall the voting record of the distinguished junior Senator from New York, let me say that I believe that in those days sometimes he stood almost alone as a Republican Member in the House of Representatives. He was most progressive and most constructive. On many occasions he stood alone in the House of Representatives voting in favor of such measures.

Senator Vandenberg gave many reasons why a watchdog committee should be established. The amendment I submitted to the committee was based upon that idea. I do not know whether I shall submit the amendment to the Senate, because there are other pertinent resolutions which have been passed by the Senate setting forth the watchdog concept.

But, as I said in my statement, which appears in the RECORD, it is significant that there was, and in this body there is, an intelligent constitutional argument as to whether or not there is an improper request for a delegation to the executive branch of the war-making power of Congress. I stated there was a twilight zone of opinion as to whether there was or was not such a request, but the important point is that we ought to bridge the gap in an effort to truly create a bi-partisan foreign policy. I gave the names of the members of the

committee, and, for the RECORD, I refer to page 908 of the hearings before the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services. Recently, for the first time in years they have been called into conference at the White House. As the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] said, it was the first time he had ever been called into such a conference, at least since 1954, although he is the second ranking member of the Foreign Relations Committee.

The President, after he had called the conference, had a perfect right to speak to the people, as he did, over television.

I cannot agree with the handling of the sanctions situation with regard to Israel. By virtue of the fortitude and courage which has been shown by Israel in saying, "Give us further guaranties," there has been a decided change. I do not know what happened this afternoon at the United Nations, as I have not read a report of it. At any rate there has been a forcing, there has been clearer thinking, there has been a more constructive thinking by all of us concerning the Arab-Israeli problem and the resolution under consideration. Obviously the question arises if we cannot solve the sanctions issue should we commit ourselves to spend hundreds of millions of dollars in support of a policy that is foredoomed to failure?

I say to the junior Senator from New York that \$200 million will not be the end of it, for next year there will be another \$200 million, and the year after that another \$200 million. I do not believe, under those circumstances, that my constituents would particularly favor that.

If we spent \$1 billion in the Middle East on a good, constructive program, such as the junior Senator from New York has outlined in the Senate this afternoon, which would bring peace, stability, and the friendship of the people of the Middle East area, I say it would be well worth the price, rather than to muddle in and out of a situation which may throw us into an atomic war and world war III.

I again commend the junior Senator from New York for a very excellent statement, but despite the excellent speech I have heard I wanted to express the reservation which I had in mind, not as to the aims and objectives, but as to whether he has the insight—and I refer to the Secretary of State—and whether he has the vision, to carry out this program which is vitally necessary, in my own opinion, for the strength and security of our own Nation, and the peace of the world.

Mr. JAVITS. I believe the Senator from Colorado has uttered words which will find an echo in the hearts of many people in our country. In reply I merely wish to say that in order to resolve the debate and come to a vote, which the Senate will do before very long, it is necessary, as we sometimes do in law cases, to assume the Senator is right, but nevertheless support the effort, which is a beginning and is opening the door available to us. I urge that we pass through it and, having passed through it, give to the effort not only the

initiative of those in the present administration, but our own initiative. But as to the desirability of passing through the door, which is the point of my address to the Senate today, I have no doubt.

Mr. CARROLL. Does the Senator express the hope that the most inevitable thing in life has changed and there is hope for a more constructive effort to bring about the end which we all desire?

Mr. JAVITS. Yes.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I have been following closely the debate on the Middle East resolution so that I might inform myself as fully as possible concerning this vital issue before we shall have to vote on it.

However, I confess to being disturbed over the turn that the debate has been taking. We are hearing from both sides of the aisle what amounts to some indiscriminate and often reckless attacks upon the fundamental concepts of an internationalist foreign policy. These attacks have been directed not so much against the Middle East resolution as such, but actually against the United Nations, against all overseas financial expenditures, against our NATO alliance with the democracies of the Atlantic community, and against the entire conception of an American foreign policy founded on constructive relationships with other nations.

Already the leader of the Republican Party—the President's party—in the Senate has delivered a major attack at a college forum on the organization and composition of the United Nations. From both sides of the aisle, we have recently heard the idea of international cooperation denounced, ridiculed, and held up to disdainful contempt. My mail is beginning to reflect the impact of this kind of debate upon public opinion. People without information and extremists are sending in many letters which can only be described as inflammatory or hysterical and highly isolationist in tone.

Perhaps as a result of this trend in our mail, speeches on the Senate floor now tell us that the voters are overwhelmingly opposed to all sorts of international commitments—and that woe betide the public figure who dares to defy such sentiment.

#### SENATORS MUST EXERCISE RESPONSIBILITY AND COURAGE

To begin with, Mr. President, I doubt if the United States Senate is supposed to be some vast Univac machine which faithfully reflects each batch of letters and telegrams. We are supposed to be responsive to our mail, but not dominated by it. Furthermore, I know of no governmental activity easier or more tempting to level demagoguery against than the whole principle of overseas programs. We are hearing now that farmers will be prosperous, for example, if only we can choke off foreign aid. Well, this administration is appropriating much more money than ever for so-called farm programs, and still the family-sized farm does not enjoy prosperity. How do our overseas expenditures figure in that? Indeed, I always

have thought that an aggressive program of international trade and commerce might be the one way to dispose of some of our agricultural surplus production.

Mr. President, I have not made up my mind definitely on the Middle East resolution. I believe the purpose of the present debate is to clarify the questions at stake. I still eagerly await this clarification. It is urgently needed. But, to date, much of the debate has seemed to me more calculated to weaken our national faith in an enlightened, 20th century foreign policy than to analyze and discuss the Middle East issues.

Since the preset debate began, I have listened to Senators attacking foreign aid, hip and thigh. They have lambasted it—horse, foot, and dragon. They have found in it no good and much evil. Yet our postwar programs of international commitments and cooperation were initiated by a Democratic President, Harry S. Truman, and by Gen. George C. Marshall; and the successors to these programs are now carried on by Republican President Dwight D. Eisenhower and Secretary of State John Foster Dulles. Many other eminent leaders of both parties, or of no party, in the executive branch and in the Congress, have devoted their best efforts to these policies. Is it possible that this great Nation has been so unfortunate as to have only knaves or fools at the helm of its Ship of State for the past decade? I refuse to believe such an implication, yet that would be the inevitable logic of some of the speeches we have been hearing recently.

This is a time, Mr. President, for responsibility and not for reckless destruction of the whole basis of our postwar international policies.

Yet, unless the trend and tone of the debate change, it is my fear that the most significant result of these past few weeks will not be passage or defeat of a resolution involving certain relatively superficial phases of the Middle East problem, but the wreckage of any chances for responsible statesmanship in the realm of foreign policy for years to come.

#### ADMINISTRATION MUST BE CANDID WITH THE PUBLIC

If this fearful result were to emerge from the present debate, much of the blame must rest on the administration itself for the manner in which it has presented the substance of the resolution we are debating. Not only have the President and the Secretary of State failed to enlighten the public on the exact nature and dimensions of the problem with which the proposed resolution is to deal, in preparation for an intelligent discussion of that problem and our proposed policies toward it—no, Mr. President; there is every evidence that the administration has equally failed in the preparation of the supposed program itself, so that neither the public nor the Congress can form any real understanding of what is proposed, and why. Is it any wonder if the only impressions created—rightly or wrongly—are that, first, we are to risk American lives in defense of Arab selfish interests and desert sands, and,

second, that we are to spend vast amounts of American funds on unspecified projects in those areas?

Mr. President, such undertakings as our mutual security programs, technical assistance and reciprocal trade require a great deal of understanding on the part of the American people. For the sake of future gains in world peace, security, freedom and prosperity, such programs call for apparent self-sacrifice and altruism now, in an era when more than half the residents of the world are hungry and there is loose on the planet a destructive force which could totally wipe out the human race. Does anyone think the Senate debate of recent days has uniformly been calculated to produce that understanding, idealism and altruism?

Mr. President, if there is a scintilla of truth to some of the speeches delivered on the Senate floor during recent days, then this great democracy has suffered the misfortune to be governed during the past 10 years by some of the most misguided and ill-advised men on earth. Such instrumentalities as mutual security, the United Nations, international cooperation and reciprocal trade programs did not, like Topsy, "just growed." They were brought into existence, on our part, by American Presidents and American Secretaries of State. If these institutions are as foolish and wretched as some Senators claim they are, what can be said for the sort of men—Democrats and Republicans alike—whom the American people have been entrusting with foreign policy? Either Senators are speaking too passionately and too dogmatically, or else America has been in sorry hands, indeed. If certain Senate speeches are accurate in fact, I fear for the future of the United States.

#### PRESIDENTS ARE NOT ALWAYS WRONG AND SENATORS RIGHT

Of course, it is always possible that the men in the White House may sometimes have been right, and some Senators wrong. I will not venture that as an outright statement of fact, but I will merely vouchsafe such a possibility. It could be the case, however.

Mr. President, I am not yet ready to judge the issue in the present instance. I have been disturbed by the obvious incompleteness, both of the diagnosis given us by the administration of the asserted danger facing the free world in the Middle East, and of its prescription for it. I have been disturbed by the inconsistency of the President's simultaneous readiness to support sanctions against Israel, the most democratic and Western-oriented nation in the Middle East, while we are told that this central Middle Eastern crisis in Arab-Israel relations has no place in, or even bearing upon, the danger with which we are supposed to concern ourselves in the pending resolution. However, Mr. President, when the time comes to vote on the resolution, I shall do so on the merits of its purposes as I see them, in the light of the overall internationalist policies America has followed in the postwar years. I do not believe that the present debate



should serve as an occasion for destructive broadside attacks on the whole underlying conception of these internationalist policies, which do not need to stand or fall on the weakness of the Eisenhower administration's present proposals for the Middle East. After this one issue has been disposed of, we still must have left a bipartisan and effective foreign policy which will function to stem Communist aggression and bolster free government throughout the world.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am very pleased that I could be in the Senate Chamber at the time the Senator from Oregon made his remarks, because I gather that what the Senator is concerned about is the possibility that in the discussion of this resolution we may actually set loose forces, or at least generate attitudes, which could be injurious to the whole structure of international cooperation. Is that the Senator's view?

Mr. NEUBERGER. That is my view, and that is the fear I attempted to express in the comparatively brief remarks to which the Senator from Minnesota refers.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am sure the Senator would agree with me that we on this side of the aisle—and I trust also those on the other side—would not want to indulge in the kind of reckless invective and petulant argument which was so characteristic of the Republican leadership during the Truman administration.

I say that with a note of sadness, and yet of truth. I can recall the bitterness of the debates in this Chamber, and the unrelenting attacks not only upon the wisdom of the policies of Mr. Acheson, former Secretary of State, but actually upon his ability, his loyalty, and his character.

It is fair to say that Mr. Truman did not have the protective cloak around him that the present occupant of the White House has been privileged to enjoy. Yet under the Truman administration some of the greatest instruments of American foreign policy were consummated.

Therefore I hope that we on this side, while some may have good reason to be doubtful as to the wisdom of the resolution before us, will remember that in discussing it we should confine our remarks to the resolution and its strength and weaknesses, and not run wild over the entire area of American foreign policy, which has been meticulously and carefully built.

I ask that my colleague from Oregon note with me again—as he did in his remarks—that this resolution had an unfortunate beginning. The majority leader said he was a little tired of "government by leak." I am sure we all know to what he referred. There has been a tendency to give the "razzledazzle" public-relations treatment to matters of high policy; yes, of fundamental, basic policy relating to the very security of this country.

It is true that many Members of this body and of the other House were very much upset over the fact that a resolution which apparently bears upon the

security of our Republic was first advanced in the press rather than in the nature of a formal document presented to the Senate or to the House of Representatives.

Also, many Members of the Senate were disappointed by the lack of candor which was exhibited by some of the administration witnesses in the presentation of support for the resolution. The argument over economic aid is characteristic of what I have referred to.

The junior Senator from Minnesota has supported economic aid in every vote in the Senate. I have supported it at times to the disappointment of my friends and colleagues. I believe in an effective foreign economic policy. I am trying to help build one. But I say that the lack of documentation for foreign economic aid in the pending resolution as presented by the administration really jeopardizes constructive, effective foreign-aid programs and policies. It is to this subject that the Senator from Minnesota and other Senators have referred on other occasions.

I do not intend to vote to kill foreign aid, but I do not want the debate on this resolution to result in discrediting effective foreign aid. Therefore, I think it is pertinent, and very important, to note that the Senator from Texas, the majority leader, was able to have written into the resolution as reported by the committees an amendment reading as follows:

None of the additional authorization contained in this section shall be used until 15 days after the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives and, when military assistance is involved, the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives have been furnished a report showing the object of the proposed use, the country for the benefit of which such use is intended, and the particular appropriation or appropriations for carrying out the provisions of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, from which the funds are proposed to be derived:

The purpose of that amendment is to see to it that Members of Congress are at least informed as to the purposes for which that money would be expended; in other words, that money would not be expended for projects, programs, and uses, which would adversely reflect upon an economic assistance program.

I mention these facts, because the resolution as reported from the committee contains three basic amendments which I believe greatly improve the resolution.

The first amendment Mr. President, places the responsibility for the use of our Armed Forces on the President, as Commander in Chief under the Constitution. The amendment provides:

To this end, if the President determines the necessity thereof, the United States is prepared to use armed forces to assist any nation or group of nations requesting assistance against armed aggression from any country controlled by international communism.

That is a fundamental amendment, and it complies with the traditions and precedents of our constitutional history.

The second amendment was offered by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. It provides that the \$200 million authorized shall no longer have placed on it the limitations imposed in the Mutual Security Act of 1954, and that that \$200 million is authorized to be used until the end of the fiscal year June 30, 1957. That is a far cry from what the administration presented.

The administration presented a resolution in which the authorization ran on ad infinitum, to the point of eternity. This is a direct limitation, and requires that Congress shall review the entire matter of economic assistance on a fiscal-year basis.

I point these matters out because, as the Senator from Oregon has indicated, there is doubt in my mind as to how one should vote on the resolution. However, I do not want my criticism of the economic assistance aspects of the resolution to be interpreted as my being opposed to a constructive economic policy. In fact, I cry out today for the administration to formulate and to present to us a foreign economic policy. It has none.

The administration has many ad hoc and part-time policies. It would be well for every Member of the Senate to read the Millikan-Rostow report from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology on the subject of America's foreign economic policy. It contains some very important reading. Members of the Senate should determine once and for all what kind of foreign-aid program we should have. Instead of a policy based on 3 months, 6 months, or 2 months, or on any other hit-and-miss basis, it should be a policy designed to meet long-term objectives.

Ninety percent of all our foreign economic aid has been for military support. That is hardly an economic policy. That is a military policy.

The Senator from Oregon has been very generous in yielding time to me. I will conclude by saying that his reference to the United Nations is entirely appropriate. I know there are some people who are condemning what is going on in the United Nations today, and our activities in the United Nations, in order to discredit the United Nations. The Senator from Minnesota feels that if the administration will effectively utilize the facilities of the United Nations and give direction, leadership, and guidance, the United Nations will be able to be an effective instrument in certain areas.

The United Nations is only 11 years old. It is not fully developed. We ought not to ask, as the saying goes, a boy to do a man's job. The United Nations ought not to be given impossible problems to solve. It ought to be given problems that are possible of solutions. Therefore I am not going to join in the hue and cry of condemning the U. N. What should be done is to constructively criticize our failure to give leadership in the United Nations.

A classic example of that is to be found in the existing situation relating to the Israel-Egyptian situation, where we are constantly saying that we are going to wait and see what other people

do, and that we are going to wait and see what the African-Asian bloc does.

That is not leadership. That is even poor following.

As I have suggested before, we might at least consider what our friends to the north, in Canada, are doing. Canada has had the courage to stand up against Britain when the British went into Egypt. We might cooperate with a nation that has demonstrated sensitivity to the problems of the modern world. The Dominion of Canada has shown great courage. By working with the Dominion of Canada, at least on hemispheric policy, we might be able to contribute to leadership and direction.

However, I sense that when some people want to cover up for the failures or the errors of judgment or the inadequacies of our own foreign policy, they usually say that the United Nations is at fault.

Let the record be clear that no sanctions could be imposed on anyone in the United Nations if we did not want them imposed. That is the first point.

The second point is that there can be effective economic and political leadership in the United Nations if the United States will lead.

I hope that while Mr. Mollet, the French Prime Minister, is in the United States, we can reestablish the spirit of friendship and cooperation which has symbolized our foreign policy for many years.

I conclude by saying that I am delighted the Prime Minister of France is visiting our President and our country. I hope those meetings will produce again that great spirit of fraternity which has characterized the relationships between the United States and the Republic of France. France is a great country. It has a great people. It has great history. It is doing great things. French political leadership, despite all the criticism that has been leveled against it, has given the world the Coal and Steel Community, the proposals for the European Defense Community, and, more recently, the Common Trade Area Community. The French are struggling to strengthen the areas of freedom. I hope that we will be able to reestablish our friendly relationships with the French and the British, with mutual respect for our differences, but with a great faith in those things that unite us.

I again thank the Senator from Oregon for his fine statement and for his generosity in yielding to me.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank the Senator from Minnesota for his very effective response to my remarks.

I wish to say this to the Senator from Minnesota. I do not have his long experience in the Senate or the benefit of his very able service on the Committee on Foreign Relations. However, I believe he does share with me the knowledge of how difficult it is in the Senate, under present circumstances, to try to be a responsible member of the Democratic Party.

I remember that last year, when the Eisenhower administration was urging that Congress allow the administration to continue aid to the Tito government

in Yugoslavia, so far as my own State is concerned—and I can only speak for the State of Oregon—it was a highly unpopular proposal in Oregon.

The Republican floor leader in the Senate and, I believe, also the chairman of the Republican Policy Committee, joined in submitting an amendment on the floor to strike out aid to Tito in the bill which provided foreign aid for various countries throughout the world.

The Republicans had their cake and ate it, too. If I am not mistaken, we liberal Democrats, who have been at times berated all over the place for allegedly being leftists, had to stand on the floor of the Senate and save the Eisenhower administration's program with respect to assistance to Yugoslavia.

After the Congress adjourned I went home to my State. I spoke all over the State at various meetings, not only at nonpartisan meetings, but at other meetings, where I campaigned for the reelection—happily successfully—of my distinguished senior colleague in the Senate.

On many occasions people came up to me—almost always they were members of President Eisenhower's political party—and told me how disappointed they were that I had voted to continue aid to that blackguard and rascal, Tito. When I told them that this was the specific request made by the President and the Secretary of State, many of them refused to believe it. I asked friends of mine to check at county courthouses on the political affiliation of these people, because in my State people register to vote by political parties, and almost invariably all the people who were thus so critical of me were members of President Eisenhower's party. They refused to believe that President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles would suggest so unpatriotic and un-American a policy as continuing aid to Tito. The only way I could convince these people that the "terrible" Democrats had voted for a policy favored by Secretary Dulles and President Eisenhower was to send them copies of the letter from Mr. Dulles, in which he stated this policy was adopted with the full concurrence of the President. The administration has had its cake and has eaten it, too. The administration has looked to us on this side of the aisle to vote for their program, to save it from being wrecked by the Republican leaders, and then we get berated by Republicans when we go home.

I have been a Member of the Senate for only a very short time, but I remember that virtually the same thing happened with respect to reciprocal trade.

I think, on 5 or 6 rollcalls, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and I voted with the administration for a 3-year extension of the reciprocal trade program. But when I went home I was criticized by Republicans because I allegedly voted to wreck the tuna fish industry or the cherry industry. When I told them it was an administration program, they said, "Ike would not propose a program that you Democrats would vote for." They did not believe that the 3-year extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act or the allowance of aid to Tito are part of the Eisenhower pro-

gram, because they think that only Democrats would do anything like that, and that "old Ike" would not do such a thing.

We have been depended upon to defend the Republican foreign policy from attack by their own Republican leaders in the Senate, but when we go home, we get criticized by the Republicans in our own States.

Mr. President, I wish to add one thing which I think is quite significant.

Almost at the very time the President of the United States went on the air to appeal for United Nations action in the Middle East crisis—action which many of us hope will not come to pass in the terms which the President favors—almost at the very time the President did that, the Republican minority leader had made a major foreign-policy speech criticizing the very composition, the very organization, of the United Nations.

One of the things that amuses me is that some Republicans will quote with approval a criticism of the United Nations on the basis that, in the United Nations, there are certain countries which have a thousand times the population of other countries.

I do not know whether they realize it, but that could also be a criticism of the United States Senate, where certain States have 65 or 70 times the population of other States. But I think it highlights the whole Alice-in-Wonderland atmosphere of this situation, that almost while the administration is offering all these platitudes about the United Nations, the administration's chief Senate spokesman is making a policy speech criticizing the entire fundamental basis of the structure of the United Nations.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I wish to revert to something said a moment ago about Democratic support meeting with criticism in the Senator's home State. As a matter of fact, did not the Senator also encounter the situation that during the campaign it was thrown up to him constantly that the Republicans gave the President better support for his foreign policy than did the Democrats, and that many times that argument would be made by the very leaders to whom the Senator has made reference?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Constantly. One other amusing thing happened in my State. There was a Republican Member of the House of Representatives who was extremely isolationist in his voting. He was an opponent of foreign aid. He was defeated in 1956 for reelection, but he has now been appointed to a foreign-aid position under this administration with reference to a program which he voted against steadily during his career.

Mr. SPARKMAN. There have been analogous situations both in connection with foreign aid and with other programs of the Federal Government. For instance, one of the criticisms which I think is a sound one is that in a great many of the agencies which have been set up as independent agencies for the purpose of regulating certain segments of our industry, persons have been appointed from the very ranks that were supposed to be regulated. As a matter



of fact, predominantly the employees have come from those ranks.

Mr. NEUBERGER. We often have to take political risks to support the administration's foreign policy. I am not objecting to that. If we run for this particular office we should expect to hazard political risks.

I asked the capable girl in my office who handles the mail to give me a statement concerning it, and she told me that my mail ran 5 to 1 against the administration's reciprocal trade program, for which I voted. I am speaking of my mail from the State of Oregon. I do not think I received one letter favoring aid to Tito. We are supposed to vote according to our conscience and our own best judgment, but it is at least interesting that we have to undergo political jeopardy for defending the administration's program.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I think we should give a great deal of consideration to foreign policy. I understand the Senator believes in resolving doubts in favor of the President on any foreign policy question, but at the same time having an obligation to criticize constructively such foreign policy as the President may promulgate. Is that correct?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Definitely. If it meant staying in the United States Senate for the rest of my natural life, I would never indulge in the type of criticism such as that which was leveled against President Truman by certain Republicans during the Korean war.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Does the distinguished Senator agree with me that under our form of government as it has developed through the years the President of the United States has not only the power but the responsibility to promulgate and to execute foreign policy?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Definitely. Most assuredly the Senator is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If that be true, does it not follow logically that it is our duty to scrutinize carefully the portion of foreign policy in which we alone have a part in carrying into effect, such as confirming nominations, ratifying treaties, appropriation of funds, and all the things which are necessary to carry foreign policy into effect, and to engage in constructive criticism whenever we believe the proposals are justly subject to such criticism?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Of course, the distinguished Senator from Alabama is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I commend the Senator from Oregon for the very fine presentation he has made. I regret that I was not on the floor to hear all of it, but I have enjoyed greatly the part I have heard.

I particularly wish to commend the Senator from Oregon for the sterling defense he has made of the United Nations. I agree with the statement made by our friend, the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], with reference to the United Nations.

It was my pleasure and privilege to have served as a delegate to the United Nations in 1950. I count it as a real distinction. I have been a strong believer in the United Nations, recognizing all the time its imperfections and its weak-

nesses, but believing that as we recognize its imperfections, our obligation becomes even greater to work harder to make the United Nations the kind of effective organization which we dream it may someday be.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank the Senator from Alabama for his defense of the United Nations, because the United Nations is the only international organization which exists in the entire world in which we can vote rather than plunge into dreadful atomic war.

If I may address a personal comment to the Senator from Alabama, Mrs. Neuberger and I have said many times, when we have watched Senator SPARKMAN in the Senate, that he has confirmed our belief we voted for the right candidate for Vice President of the United States in 1952.

I now yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. First, Mr. President, I should like to second the observation by the Senator from Oregon relating to the Senator from Alabama. Indeed, that was a vote for the right man and for the right cause.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Would that it had prevailed.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I may say, Mr. President, that these words of comfort are indeed welcome, even though they come—

Mr. HUMPHREY. Belatedly?

Mr. SPARKMAN. No; from a minority representation. However, let me say to both the distinguished Senators that I speak in truth and yet facetiously about the minority in which we found ourselves in 1952.

However, there is one thing with reference to that election of which I have always been proud. I have never, at any time, felt downhearted as a result of the outcome of that election. I felt proud of the fact that 27 million Americans voted their belief in the principles for which the Democratic Party stood.

While I am thinking of that, I may add that I was in Kansas City last night, and a newspaperman asked me this amazing question: "What about the Democratic Party? Do you think it will come back?"

I believe they were the words he used. I said "Before I answer that question, I should say that I do not accept the implication of your question. The Democratic Party has not been away. As a matter of fact, it seems to me you should be asking that question about the Republican Party, because in 1956 the Democrats among the American people expressed their confidence in the Democratic Party by electing a Democratic Senate, a Democratic House, and a majority of the governors. They elected also a Democratic majority in many of the State legislatures throughout the country. I am certain the same thing would be found to be true if you inquired about the election of officials to positions in county courthouses and to other political positions."

I said to him, "I say the Democratic Party won a tremendous victory in 1956. We made a clean sweep except for one man."

He then asked me, "Do you think that in 1960 you will get that office?"

I said, "Yes; I believe we will make a clean sweep in 1960."

Mr. NEUBERGER. The Democratic Party is the healthiest corpse anybody in this country ever saw.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am certain the Senator wants the Record to be complete and accurate. Lest anyone misunderstand what the Senator from Oregon has said when he spoke of aid to Tito, the resolution or the proposal on which we voted in the Senate was not merely for aid to Tito, but it was a vote for confidence in the integrity and judgment of the President of the United States.

That resolution, if the Senator will recall, provided that we would give Marshal Tito aid, but that we were willing to vote that if the President determined it was in the vital interest of the United States and the national security of this country, he could, if in his judgment all those factors prevailed, extend aid to Tito. That is what we voted for.

Mr. SPARKMAN. And the President made a public pronouncement to that effect.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

The Senator from Oregon has commented about the rather isolationist former Representative from his State who has recently been given a choice administration job in the foreign aid field, although he voted against foreign aid.

I have almost come to the conclusion, I regretfully say, that the way for one to get a job in an agency which he has opposed is, first, to lose the election, and then to secure an appointment to the agency which he sought to kill before he lost the election.

I remember when Mr. Cole was appointed head of the housing administration. He had voted against public housing when he was a Member of Congress, but afterward he was put in charge of it. I said then that that was like putting a fox in charge of a chicken coop. I still think that that was perhaps the most accurate description I could give.

The Senator from Alabama knows that the present Director of the International Cooperation Administration—the ICA—Mr. Hollister, had a record of opposition to the ICA and the policies and programs under the jurisdiction of that agency.

It seems to me that this is a part of what must be called the schizophrenia of the Republican Party. Is it any wonder that the President wants to modernize his party? Is it any wonder that he is asking for some kind of rehabilitation of his party?

We witnessed that in the Senate today when one of our distinguished colleagues rose and said that Paul Hoffman was not the kind of Republican his party could use; that they would wash their hands of him.

Mr. President, if Mr. Hoffman is not wanted in the Republican Party—I have only one invitation; I can only speak for myself as a Democrat—I think he would be a wonderful addition to any organization, and we would be glad to welcome him into the Democratic Party, if he would join with us in our programs.

The other observation I wish to make is this: The Senator from Oregon has pointed out how difficult it is for Democratic Senators to maintain a sense of responsibility. I have said that we Democrats must never be irresponsible, but that we ought to be irrepressible. Let us not be irresponsible; let us be irrepressible in what we believe and in the advocacy of what we believe. It has been mighty difficult not to let our emotions get the best of us, particularly when in 1952 the leaders of the Republican Party, then campaigning, said they were going to unleash Chiang Kai-shek. Poor old Chiang. Not only is he still on a leash; he has a halter on him so firmly that he can hardly wiggle.

But we were going to unleash Chiang Kai-shek. But then he lost some islands in the north, and he has been tied closer to home than any young boy who has violated the household rules and has been sent behind the closet door.

Then Senators may recall that there was to be a liberation. That idea took hold among certain groups in this country. Our friends of Polish extraction and of Lithuanian extraction—great Americans—felt that somehow or other the Democratic policy was one of containment, not one of liberation.

The Republicans said, "We are going to liberate."

All at once someone decided he wanted to get liberated. What happened?

The Secretary of State said, "No; you are not supposed to get liberated the way you are trying to liberate yourselves. You are not supposed to fight for it or accept our help."

What I am trying to point out is that it is extremely difficult not to try to take advantage of what are such glaring weaknesses and conditions that they are obvious even to the blind. To exploit these issues for political purposes would in a sense do an injustice to sound, constructive, and creditable foreign policy. For instance, does the Senator from Oregon recall the emphasis on "agonizing reappraisal" and "new look"?

The plain truth is that I am afraid some of the propagandists in the Republican ranks decided that the way to get a foreign policy was to "jazz it up" public-relations-wise. The truth is that that kind of policy became foreign to our friends and foreign to our constituents, and no one could quite understand it. Much of our trouble can be attributed to that situation. At the proper time we shall discuss it in more detail.

I am sure the Senator from Oregon has asked us to discuss the pending joint resolution with conviction and with conscience, and that is the way the debate will be maintained.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator from Minnesota places that interpretation upon my remarks, because it was my intent and purpose to encourage responsibility in foreign policy.

Before yielding the floor, I wish to say to the Senator from Minnesota that I am extremely pleased that earlier in the debate he spoke about the responsibility of our own Democratic leadership in the Senate. Both he and I realize that occasionally some of our liberal friends

have been critical of the Democratic majority leader of the Senate. I am relatively new to the Senate, as compared to the service here of the Senator from Minnesota. But I wish to say that I, for one, glory in the fact and rejoice in the fact that the Democratic Members of this body have so responsible a leader as the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON]. There have been many occasions, as is evident to anyone who is familiar with American politics, when the Democratic leader could have used demagoguery or opportunism—if we wish to use those descriptive terms—to stand against such administration proposals as foreign aid, the continued program of giving a certain measure of assistance to Tito, the reciprocal trade program, and other features of the administration's foreign policy, many of which were inherited from previous administrations, and rightly so. I am very proud that the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] has not used those political openings, but that, instead, he has placed what he considers to be the welfare of his country above certain ephemeral political opportunities for his party. I have felt great pride and faith in that fact. It seems to me that when we read the history of these times, we shall find that the occasions when statesmanship has been demonstrated in our country have been those when the welfare of our country has been placed ahead of temporary political advantage. Every one of us familiar with the state of public opinion in the Nation realizes that there is a great deal of political hay to be made out of blind, reckless denunciation of foreign aid or of certain international policies or of reciprocal-trade agreements, particularly in areas where certain industries or certain persons legitimately feel that their businesses or jobs may have been hurt by reciprocal trade.

I feel that the Democratic majority leader of the Senate has certainly demonstrated a high order of statesmanship when he has not taken narrow or partisan advantage of his political opportunities on occasions when he has felt the national welfare demanded that we support the administration, no matter how unpopular its policies might be. I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] about the characteristic statesmanship of our majority leader, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], in those instances and circumstances.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield further to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am very happy that the Senator from Oregon has made those comments. They bring to my mind the fact that a political party does not have to be unanimous in order to have unity. Certainly there is a great deal of difference between unanimity and unity, as we have stated many times on this floor. Unity leaves room for differences based on respect for the points of

view of others and their background and their outlook and their experience. Unanimity means enforced discipline which would leave no room for differences of opinion.

Let me say that I have not always voted as the majority leader has requested or as he himself has voted. But I believe it fair to say that we have had leadership which has been considerate and temperate and experienced, and at all times has put the welfare of the country above all else. The majority leader has an excellent record in the field of international relations, in particular. This has been to the benefit of the administration.

As the Senator from Oregon knows, our majority leader once said to us that he did not view the role of the opposition as one of simply opposing. Instead, he has used the role of the opposition as being that of opposing when we believe that the majority or the administration is wrong, and of supporting it when we believe it is right. That does not eliminate constructive debate—either on the pending joint resolution or any other subject.

In the case of the pending measure, there is considerable argument, because there are doubts and uncertainties about it. When the vote on the pending joint resolution is taken, we must vote either for it or against it; we cannot vote "maybe." I have often said to my constituents that when we come to decide about one of the primary issues, I often wish there were a column "down the middle." Often there is talk about going down the middle of the road; and such a course is supposed to be a safe one. However, when we vote on a bill or other measure, we must either vote for it or vote against it; we must either vote "yea" or "nay"; there is no "maybe" column, which might help one be popular with many persons.

The purpose of the debate is to give us an opportunity to express any doubts or misgivings we may have, as well as to give us an opportunity to express our convictions. Finally, when the debate has concluded, we resolve the issue by voting. That is what will happen in the case of the pending joint resolution.

That is what the majority leader stated in his opening remarks, after the joint resolution was called up. He proposed that there be thorough debate, that there be responsible debate. He urged that the debate not be limited, that there be no attempt to cut off any reasonable degree of participation in the debate or of examination of the details of the pending measure. But he pointed out that ultimately we must vote on the joint resolution. I believe that the people of the country should know that that is what we wish to do, and that there is a determination here not to stall, not to play politics with the joint resolution, but to examine it and evaluate it, and then decide about it, and to express our decision by means of our vote.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Minnesota for his very cogent and effective remarks.



Mr. President, if no other Senator desires me to yield to him, I now relinquish the floor.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina obtained the floor.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me, to permit me to suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. LONG. Then, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gore	Morton
Allott	Green	Mundt
Anderson	Hayden	Murray
Barrett	Hennings	Neely
Beall	Hickenlooper	Neuberger
Bennett	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bible	Holland	Pastore
Blakley	Hruska	Payne
Bricker	Humphrey	Potter
Bush	Ives	Purtell
Butler	Jackson	Revercomb
Byrd	Javits	Robertson
Capehart	Jenner	Russell
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Carroll	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Case, N. J.	Kefauver	Scott
Case, S. Dak.	Kennedy	Smathers
Chavez	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Church	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Clark	Kuchel	Sparkman
Cooper	Lausche	Stennis
Cotton	Long	Symington
Dirksen	Magnuson	Talmadge
Douglas	Malone	Thurmond
Dworshak	Mansfield	Thye
Eastland	Martin, Iowa	Watkins
Ellender	McCarthy	Wiley
Ervin	McClellan	Williams
Flanders	McNamara	Young
Frear	Monroney	
Goldwater	Morse	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). A quorum is present.

#### ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### PROMOTION OF PEACE AND STABILITY IN THE MIDDLE EAST

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 19) to authorize the President to undertake economic and military cooperation with nations in the general area of the Middle East in order to assist in the strengthening and defense of their independence.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I believe that each Senator present knows that what I shall have to say here today is not said because I am a Democrat. What I shall say will be the same as what I said when the Democrats were in office. I take the same position in matters of this kind, whether it be under a Democratic or a Republican administration.

Mr. President, I am bitterly opposed to the so-called Eisenhower doctrine. I am opposed to it in its watered-down ver-

sion. It has not, in my judgment, been watered down enough. It should be watered down to the point that unless we are prepared to stop aggression everywhere, aggression by the large nations as well as by the small nations, we should not attempt to stop it anywhere. Unless all the nations, who are members of the United Nations, contribute their pro rata share of manpower and resources, then I contend we should refrain from carrying the sole responsibility. Though the United States is the leader of the free world, ours should not be the sole responsibility of policing the entire world. We simply do not possess sufficient manpower, nor do we possess the material resources to stop aggression everywhere.

We have stopped England and France. We have not stopped Israel. To adopt an inconsistent, immoral position of forcing our friends to stop aggression against their rights, and then of assuming the responsibility of preventing aggression ourselves, and on the other hand of winking at aggression by Russia against Hungary and other satellite countries and of preventing aggression by India or by China, is wrong. Our actions in this regard are neither justified nor are they moral.

Our foreign policy under the President is disastrous. It is fraught with danger to the lives of our American boys and with danger from the standpoint of the waste of our material resources. Our foreign policy under the President and Secretary Dulles is bankrupt in its principles and purposes.

Let me prove the charges.

The President proposes to do now, at a late date and under circumstances and grave handicaps—which, by the way, he himself has created—what the President prevented others from doing when quick and certain success would have attended our efforts.

The resolution which the President wishes us to pass proposes to do now just the opposite of what he earlier prevented others from doing with their own manpower and at their own expense. This happened when the Suez crisis first arose and was at its height.

The President said in substance last year when the crisis in the Middle East was at its peak that he "could not conceive of the use of military force as a good solution." At what point did he get this conception?

What he must have meant was that the use of military force by England, France, and Israel was not a good solution. But, in essence, he now says give me 200 million extra dollars and the right—in advance of a declaration of war by the Congress—to use American forces wherever I please. The President helped to create a vacuum in the Middle East by causing the forces of England, France, and Israel to withdraw from that area. The President's resolution would fill that vacuum with our own men and material strength. What other deduction can a fair and objective mind reach?

Mr. President, how long, oh, how long, will the American people permit themselves to be the stooges of the divergent forces which are at work today?

If it was wrong for England and France to prevent the confiscation or nationalization of the Suez Canal Co. with their own men and own resources, what right have we to subject our American boys and girls and our American resources to about the same purpose and in the same undertaking? The President wants Congress to give him a blank check and an absolute grant of power and, at the same time, subject the use and deployment of such power and money according to the mandates and edicts of the United Nations. Such action gives Russia a veto over what we may wish to do. The Congress must give up its veto power and hand it over to Russia in the Security Council.

The President wants us to bypass our constitutional requirements on the one hand, but, on the other hand, he wants us to subordinate our actions to the mandates of the United Nations. In what a predicament such a lack of regard for our constitutional form of government can involve us. Shall we again give in to Russia's veto on the pretense that we need to do so to halt Russian infiltration?

The Constitution of the United States is more sacred to me than the charter or a thousand charters of the United Nations. A charter which permits force against the weak and restrains force against the strong is not much of a charter to me. A rule which does not work both ways is a poor rule to me.

A few dates and a few events will prove the truth of the charges I make. Let us look at the facts. They are not in dispute. Let us look at the events as they have occurred. The timetable of them is clear. The recorded events are not now subject to argument. The obvious deductions from them may spell just as disastrous an adventure as we experienced in Korea.

Here is the recent history of world events in their date order. In late July—July 26, 1956—Nasser announced that he was nationalizing the Suez Canal Co. Nationalization without prompt, adequate, and just compensation is confiscation. Such has been our national policy from the beginning of our history as a Nation.

Who dares to deny this? Did the President complain that Egypt had broken her treaty obligations when Egypt nationalized this private corporation, the Suez Canal Co.? Did the President complain about Egypt's immoral act of violating her duty to mankind? Did the President address himself to the question of Egypt's compliance with international law? Not at all. His efforts were directed principally to restrain England and France from protecting the rights of their citizens and their Governments as the stockholders in the Suez Canal Co. He wishes to punish Israel now because she is unwilling to be strangled to death.

We should bear in mind also that when that event was taking place, there was a treaty in existence between Egypt and England under which England had the right to go in there to protect the Suez Canal.

High level diplomatic talks began on August 1, 1956. Mr. Murphy, Assistant

Secretary of State, was first dispatched to London. Then Mr. Dulles suddenly flew back from South America and migrated after him within a few days. Throughout the month of August 1956 we talked, and talked, and proposed further discussions. Other nations were called into conference. Not one word came from the White House in condemnation of the international banditry being practiced by Nasser on the stockholders of the Suez Canal Co.

The negotiations which started in August failed in September of 1956. Every proposal for a solution of the crisis created by Nasser's piracy failed.

Russia seized the turn of events in her favor. Through her western doors, she used her might to repress the uprisings in Budapest. Hungary became a bloody battleground for the further practice of Russian tyranny.

On October the 25th, a few days before the election, the President said it was not necessary to call a special meeting of the United Nations to consider the unrest in the Middle East or, for that matter, for any other action. The President satisfied himself and the situation by saying:

The United States deplores the intervention of the Soviet military forces.

The puppet government of Hungary has defied the United Nations. That government will not even let the Secretary General of the United Nations pay it a visit. The Secretary General cannot observe what is going on in Hungary much less stop it. The President has yet to denounce the international thievery of Nasser. But look. When Israel sent her forces into the Sinai Peninsula of Egypt and was within 20 miles of the Suez Canal, and England and France, on October 30, 1956, sent Egypt an ultimatum, the President dispatched to England and France a "vigorous and emphatic protest."

In desperation, on October 31, 1956, England and France started troop movements into Egypt.

The President then took to the airwaves and in a broadcast on October 31 finally declared:

We took our first measure in this action yesterday. We went to the United Nations with a request that the forces of Israel return to their own line and that hostilities in the area be brought to a close—there, with no veto operating, the opinion of the world can be brought to bear.

Why had not the President brought the opinion of the world to bear on Nasser in his confiscations in July? Why had not the President done more than "deplore" the Russian action in Hungary and in Russia's earlier depredations in the satellite countries? What about bringing world opinion to bear on Russia? What rule of law is there that is worth a continental that does not apply equally to the strong as it should to the weak?

I hold no brief for England. I hold no brief for France. I hold no brief for Israel. I owe my loyalty and my responsibility to the boys and girls of America, to their mothers and to their fathers. I owe an obligation to the economic welfare of all the people of the

United States. Why should we play a game of international chess with the blood of our boys and girls? Why should we waste our economic well-being and permit Russia to hold the check rein of a veto over our actions?

Mr. President, it never occurred to the President to protest Egypt's unlawful actions in her seizure of the canal company. Deploring Russia's use of force in Hungary is quite a different thing from wanting to use our boys and girls and our own money to do what we had theretofore prevented France, England, and Israel from doing on their own account. These dates and these events compound a situation that requires more explanation than we have yet been given. The Secretary of State is facile of speech, easy with the gift of explanation, but the reason for our doing what we are now asked to do is a poor excuse for having prevented our true and tried allies from assuming the job on their own responsibility.

Talk not to me about our actions conforming to the mandates of the United Nations. Our actions in Korea conformed to the mandates of the United Nations. By conforming we suffered in excess of 150,000 casualties. That is the kind of conformity that I, as one American, want no more of. How soon are we to forget that we furnished more than 90 percent of the manpower and more than 85 percent of the materials in that fiasco? In Korea, we lost the only war in history in which we were ever engaged. We lost it when we could have won it. We lost it under the charm and direction of the United Nations. We will lose another war, a more costly war, unless every member of the United Nations pays its proportionate share of the cost of every such police action, not only in manpower, but in material resources. Must we be the banker for the world both in manpower and material wealth?

Shall we continue to be the blood bank for the world?

I ask again, When will the American people awaken to the disaster that awaits us when we attempt to crush the weak and merely scold the wrongdoings of the strong? Such actions do not help the morals of the world one iota. They only further weaken and hurt us. Weaken, I mean, our own United States.

Moral leadership is fine. I admire moral leadership. I adore moral leadership. But I detest intellectual dishonesty. I detest immorality that permits the strong to run rampant in committing violations which result in the weak knuckling under to the forces of the strong. I say in substance with the leader of the Republican side in this Chamber, that such a course of conduct by us is immoral, unjustified, and unwarranted. I say in substance with the leader on our side of the aisle, that it is wrong to pressure only one side of a two-sided dispute. No amount of juggling of words, twisted phrases, doubletalk, schoolteacher approach, or radio adaptation of "Father knows best" from the President or his wandering boy, Secretary Dulles, can convince me that it is moral for Russia to crush Hungary, but that it is improper for England and

France to protect their property interests in the Suez Canal Co. This immorality of action is compounded a thousand times and made infinitely worse from every point of view I hold when it is proposed that we, in America, shall now do what we prevented others from doing on their own account and in their own interests.

In November we voted with Russia and Egypt for a cease-fire. We voted against England, France, and Israel.

In the early days of November, just before the election, the British and French invaded Egypt. The Russians had already sent their armored tanks into Hungary. At about the same time, Bulganin proposed that Russia and the United States intervene in Egypt to halt invasion there. A White House spokesman said:

Neither the Soviet nor any other military forces should now enter the Middle East except under a United Nations mandate.

Nothing was said then to the effect that the United States should use its own forces under a United Nations mandate to oppose Russian forces from infiltrating the Middle East. The threat then was greater than it is today. While the threat of the use of force in Egypt and Hungary was at its peak, the President flew, on November 10, to Gettysburg to tramp over his place and look after his livestock.

The oil shortage in Western Europe was being felt to the great detriment of all our allies in NATO. Rationing in Europe was being enforced. People were suffering from the slow-down in industry. Others were suffering from insufficient heating oil. The clarion call for the protection of law and order and the preservation of peace was sounded by the then Prime Minister of England. Here are Mr. Eden's words:

Surely it was never the intention that, if the United Nations could not act, its members should not be allowed to take action to protect the interests of peace itself—if we renounce the use of force when law cannot command order, then we are in fact undermining the rule of law. We are leaving the world open to the lawbreakers.

It was not until December 12 that the General Assembly condemned Russia's cruel actions in Hungary. All the while, the Secretary General of the United Nations was forbidden even to enter Hungary; much less did the use of force to repel force there receive any consideration. If it was wrong for England to invade Egypt to prevent the theft of her property, was it right for Russia to continue to steal the freedom of millions of suffering Hungarians?

Such a contradiction of positions is so immoral and so hopelessly insolvent as to bankrupt any national policy which pursues it.

On January 5, 1957, 2 days after the Congress was convened, on Saturday, if you please, before any of our committees had been organized, the stage was set for the great drama. The President came before us with all the trimmings, fanfare, and scenery of an announcement of world-shaking proportions. Someone around the President leaked the news to the press before he spoke to us. This



was to condition us as to what was coming: That communism was threatening to invade the Middle East; that the Reds were again on the march; that Syria was being weakened by Communist inroads. That the Middle East countries were being subverted; that infiltration was raging; that freedom again was being imperiled. All these things were a part of the buildup. The President politely reversed, on January 5, 1957, the position he took in the fall, during the crisis in the Middle East, for he then said:

The use of force is inconceivable.

On January 5, 1957, the President requested an extra \$200 million over and above the other hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars we have appropriated to prevent Russian aggression by infiltration. He asked us to waive our constitutional duty. He did not propose that England, France, and Israel return to Egypt, so as to help prevent the destruction of their national interests and their properties in those countries and in Egypt.

We have only one excuse to enter the Middle East with our own boys and girls and spend our own national wealth there. That excuse is wrapped up in the question: Is it in our own national interest to do so? If it is, then is it in our own national interest to prevent our allies from doing likewise or from helping us now?

Our entering now is inconsistent with our preventing the entrance of our traditional allies. This situation, however confused and confusing, cannot be dressed up in other terms, no matter what words are employed or how they may be distorted in their meaning. On what terms does the President now wish to have this extraordinary power? This is the most extraordinary situation I have ever known. He wants the Congress to abdicate its constitutional function to declare war, and yet to make that abdication subject to the changing, uncertain, unreliable, undependable, and vacillating moods, opinions, mandates, or edicts of the conglomeration of nations constituting the United Nations. Such a proposition to me is as preposterous as it is unwise. I shall have none of it. Not a bit of it is worth a single drop of blood of any humble American boy or girl who has been the pride and joy of a helpless American mother or a devoted American father. None of such blood in such a cause will stain my vote on the President's resolution. I am for America's interests first. I shall vote for American interests first. Shall we spend our money, squander our resources, and spill our blood, as the President on January 5, 1957, said: "Consonant with the actions and recommendations of the United Nations?"

Perish the thought. Perish the plan. Perish the resolution that will permit another American life to be lost under the wishy-washy, inconsistent policies of the phrasemakers who deceive, beguile, and mislead the American people.

This policy under the resolution relieves the President from "consulting" the Congress, but requires him to conform his actions "consonant" with the

"actions and recommendations" of the United Nations. Before any American boy is sent off to fight Communist aggression in the Middle East or elsewhere, I want the American Bill of Rights to go with him. I want him to have the opportunity to win his fight. I want him to come home after his victory. I do not want these rights to be subject to Russia's veto in the United Nations. Every excuse to sidestep the Constitution and the will of the Congress is the best reason I know why we as American representatives should withhold our consent. A blank check of money and authority is the demand of every one wishing dictatorial powers. Hitler got one. Tojo was clothed with that kind of authority. Mussolini possessed such advance power. I shall withhold my vote to entrust such power to any man.

We would be led to believe by many members of the press that this advance grant of power, this go-ahead signal of authority, is necessary to ward off the subtle growth of communistic subversion. This to me is so much tommyrot. The evidence before the Internal Security Subcommittee, of which I am a member, does not justify such a conclusion. The truth of the matter is, and I add to it Chairman WALTER's statement as further proof, that we have opened the very doors of our country to thousands of Communists by our do-good policy toward the Hungarians. Many Communists have recently entered our country as refugees. Let me ask the simple question, What would have happened to the United States in 1776 if the patriots of the American colonies had fled to Canada or Mexico? There would have been no America as we know it today. We do not overcome communism by running from it. Neither do the Hungarians. I grieve for suffering humanity wherever it suffers. I mourn the loss of freedom wherever it is being lost. But when we run from communism, we strengthen it. Yet when we stand by, persevere, fight, and suffer, we can overcome it.

The myth of the communistic infiltration in the Middle East as the reason for the President's resolution disappeared as a mist before the rising sun when King Saud in one of his latest press releases said he did not feel that the Middle East was in danger of subversion from communism. The Arab World looks to Mecca. Russia would not dare to break the ties of the Arabs or to prevent their facing Mecca. The leaders in other Arabian countries seconded the note of King Saud, namely, that the Arabian countries had no fear of the growth of communism among them. Thus, in one fell swoop, falls the scarecrow of communism. The window dressing afforded by this reason—growth of communism—has to be pulled aside. In my judgment—and there is much evidence before the Internal Security Subcommittee and much evidence before the House Un-American Activities Subcommittee to sustain this judgment—we have received, through the refugees admitted to this country from Hungary, more Communist agents than today are operating from Russia in all the Middle

Eastern countries. I fear that that is so. If the President must consult the United Nations before he acts in the Middle East, that is the best reason in the whole wide world why he should consult the Congress. Why is it that he can wait to consult the United Nations, but that he cannot wait until the Congress is consulted and until it acts? I should like to have someone answer that question. Do the Members of Congress not represent the American people? When, oh when, will America come first? Why should we neglect our own people? Why should we continue to look after, suffer, bleed, and die for others? All the while, we continue to neglect our own. When will our national leaders begin pulling for America first? When will we cease sending billions of dollars to other countries, when there is so much need for a few hundred thousand dollars here at home? Consider the present situation of the farmers of our country, some of whom are in dire need of a small loan, in order to make a crop this year. But it is said that America cannot afford to make such small loans—not gifts—to farmers in the United States.

We drive away and antagonize our friends with whom we were allied in two world conflicts. We pull them away when they are seeking to protect their national interests. I refer to England and France. We assert that the use of force is inconceivable. Before the echo of his words has died away, the President says on a Saturday, in true sportsmanship style, that it is necessary to clothe him in advance with power to use force whenever he feels it is necessary, wherever he feels it is necessary, and against whomever he feels it is necessary. Such a policy lacks responsibility. Such a policy lacks statesmanship. Such a policy is dangerous. The truth of the entire matter is that he wants to place the Congress "behind the eight ball."

Such policy, on the other hand, is the very essence of irresponsibility. Representative government is being destroyed, democracy is being destroyed, and freedom itself seeps down the drain, when we give any man, whoever he may be, the power of life or death over American lives and property, as is now proposed by President Eisenhower to be given—even to him.

When Congress yields its powers to the President, without limitation or restriction, what is left of the Constitution? When the Constitution is gone, what is left except the concentration of power in the President? As Woodrow Wilson once said "Such concentration precedes the death of human freedom."

The sun does not shine today on any man in America to whom such power should be given. The sun has never shone on any President of the United States to whom I would entrust any such power.

In connection with the pending joint resolution, there is more at stake in human freedom, in human liberty, and in free government everywhere than meets the ordinary eye. Bit by bit, our Constitution has been interpreted in such a way

that human freedom and the way of life in America, as we and our forebears have known it and loved it, are gradually being whittled away. Now the right of Congress under the Constitution to "declare war" is to be transferred to the President. The lights of the past, the wisdom of the years, the experience of our forebears, their sufferings and the sacrifices of our ancestors, must now be laid aside, forgotten, forsaken, and neglected. We shall rue the day when we grant such a power. Let us return now to responsible, representative democracy. Let us not abdicate our constitutional functions and pass even a watered-down version of the joint resolution demanded by the President. Watered-down poison is no less poisonous. Poison thus becomes slackened in its death-dealing effect, but gradually and in the end it is fatal—fatal, in this case, to the best form of government ever devised in all recorded history by the toil, sacrifice, and brain of man. I say the very foundation of free government can be destroyed unless we are willing now to return to our ancient moorings and our enduring landmarks.

The net effect of what the President said in his latest broadcast on the Middle Eastern situation is that the weak, God-fearing nations must suffer because they are vulnerable, while a strong, atheistic country, such as Russia, must be side-stepped because she is strong. What an even-handed way to administer justice. To me, that is a novel concept of morality and international justice. Can such a policy be reconciled with any law of God or man that gives hope of enduring the test of time? The President, by his latest announcement, shows that expediency, not justice, prompts his actions and motivates his joint resolution. My duty in the matter is clear. My purpose will not be diverted. I will not forsake justice. I will not pursue the easy path of expediency. I will vote my conviction that no more American blood shall be shed in a fruitless, purposeless enterprise. I will not vote to give up the constitutional right of the Congress, when necessary, to declare war.

#### APPOINTMENTS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LAUSCHE in the chair). The Chair has been requested by the Vice President to announce for him the following appointments:

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] to be a member of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, to fill the vacancy caused by the retirement from the Senate of the Honorable Walter F. George.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] to be a member of the District of Columbia Auditorium Commission, vice the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], resigned.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] to be a member of the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission, to fill the vacancy caused by the retirement from the Senate of Hon. Herbert H. Lehman.

#### PROMOTION OF PEACE AND STABILITY IN THE MIDDLE EAST

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 19) to authorize the President to undertake economic and military cooperation with nations in the general area of the Middle East in order to assist in the strengthening and defense of their independence.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gore	Morton
Allott	Green	Mundt
Anderson	Hayden	Murray
Barrett	Hennings	Neely
Beall	Hickenlooper	Neuberger
Bennett	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bible	Holland	Pastore
Blakley	Hruska	Payne
Bricker	Humphrey	Potter
Bush	Ives	Purtell
Butler	Jackson	Revercomb
Byrd	Javits	Robertson
Capehart	Jenner	Russell
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Carroll	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Case, N. J.	Kefauver	Scott
Case, S. Dak.	Kennedy	Smathers
Chavez	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Church	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Clark	Kuchel	Sparkman
Cooper	Lausche	Stennis
Cotton	Long	Symington
Dirksen	Magnuson	Talmadge
Douglas	Malone	Thurmond
Dworshak	Mansfield	Thye
Eastland	Martin, Iowa	Watkins
Ellender	McCarthy	Wiley
Ervin	McClellan	Williams
Flanders	McNamara	Young
Frear	Monroney	
Goldwater	Morse	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, what is the pending question before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, which is open to amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], and myself, I send forward an amendment to the committee's substitute which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the committee's amendment, it is proposed to insert the following:

That the United States regard as vital to the national interests and world peace the preservation of the independence and integrity of the nations of the Middle East. To this end, if the President determines the necessity thereof, the United States is prepared to use Armed Forces to assist any nation or group of nations requesting assistance against armed aggression from any country controlled by international communism: *Provided*, That such employment shall be consonant with the treaty obligations of the United States and with the Charter of the United Nations.

Sec. 2. This joint resolution shall expire when the President shall determine that the peace and security of the nations in the general area of the Middle East are reasonably

assured by international conditions created by action of the United Nations or otherwise except that it may be terminated earlier by a concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress.

Amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution to promote peace and stability in the Middle East."

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I was not able to be on the floor earlier today, and I did not know whether the leadership had announced any definite time at which the Senate would adjourn this afternoon. I observe that it is now quarter to 6 o'clock. I intend to address myself to this amendment, which is in the nature of a substitute, not at any great length, but I should prefer not to do so this afternoon. I should prefer to proceed tomorrow after the conclusion of the morning business. If the leadership wishes to stay here longer this afternoon I have no alternative but to suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. RUSSELL. In the absence of any other procedure that might be taken at this time, Mr. President, I do suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gore	Morton
Allott	Green	Mundt
Anderson	Hayden	Murray
Barrett	Hennings	Neely
Beall	Hickenlooper	Neuberger
Bennett	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bible	Holland	Pastore
Blakley	Hruska	Payne
Bricker	Humphrey	Potter
Bush	Ives	Purtell
Butler	Jackson	Revercomb
Byrd	Javits	Robertson
Capehart	Jenner	Russell
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Carroll	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Case, N. J.	Kefauver	Scott
Case, S. Dak.	Kennedy	Smathers
Chavez	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Church	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Clark	Kuchel	Sparkman
Cooper	Lausche	Stennis
Cotton	Long	Symington
Dirksen	Magnuson	Talmadge
Douglas	Malone	Thurmond
Dworshak	Mansfield	Thye
Eastland	Martin, Iowa	Watkins
Ellender	McCarthy	Wiley
Ervin	McClellan	Williams
Flanders	McNamara	Young
Frear	Monroney	
Goldwater	Morse	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, we are confronted with a very rare and unusual situation in the Senate: We have Senators who do not desire to speak and do not desire to vote. Most of the time there are plenty of Senators who wish to address the Senate.

We have had a quorum call in the hope that we could get Senators to come to the floor and express themselves on the pending joint resolution.

Mr. President, if no Senator cares to speak this evening, I am prepared to



move that, pursuant to the order previously entered, the Senate stand in adjournment until tomorrow.

Mr. President, I so move.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 27, 1957, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate February 26, 1957:

##### DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Olin Hatfield Chilson, of Colorado, to be Under Secretary of the Interior, vice Clarence A. Davis, resigned.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 1957

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Heavenly Father, we thank Thee for this new day. May we rejoice and be glad in it.

We gratefully acknowledge that always and everywhere Thou art ministering unto our many needs, sustaining and supporting us in our weakness and restraining and guiding us in our strength.

Hear us in our prayers of intercession for all who are the victims of difficult and tragic circumstances.

Help us to cultivate a nobler skill in the art of brotherly living, and may our minds and hearts sense the high value and eternal worth of all human souls.

Grant that we may hasten the coming of that glorious day of prediction when every need shall be supplied.

In Christ's name we bring our petition. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

#### BUILDING ON SAND

Mrs. GRANAHAH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GRANAHAH. Mr. Speaker, throughout the long period of negotiations, conferences, statements, speeches, announcements and proposed deals for achieving peace in the Middle East, many of us have been impressed by the hopelessness of building something durable on sand.

Much of our Government's approach and many of the proposals put forward by Secretary Dulles have apparently been based entirely on an assumption of good faith and an assumption of cooperation from Egypt's Nasser.

Isn't that attempting to build on sand? Hasn't the Egyptian dictator shown that any arrangement he enters into is only at best a temporary policy which he will repudiate at will?

As a very new Member of Congress, I certainly do not presume to tell the President how to run his job. I do not pretend to be a great expert in foreign policy. I am seeking to learn the duties of being a Member of Congress and I am trying hard to become familiar with the operation of our Government generally. I admit I have much to learn.

Nevertheless, I should think by now it would be obvious to anyone in our Government, and particularly anyone assigned to responsible duties in connection with foreign policy, that before attempting to settle this far-reaching crisis in the Middle East on the basis of what we hope Nasser might be willing to do, that we make sure we know his real intentions.

Much of the difficulty in getting Israel out of the areas the U. N. says Israel should evacuate is based on the plain fact that Nasser has agreed to and then repudiated a series of understandings which turned out to be insincere, or at least turned out to be misunderstandings. As long as we let policy be set that way, any peace will be built on Egyptian sand.

#### THE UNITED NATIONS AND EGYPT

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the American conscience is uneasy, as it views our Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde foreign policy.

No word of criticism for Egypt which still stands in contempt of a U. N. resolution, but righteous indignation and threats of sanctions against Israel under similar circumstances.

How to reconcile these opposites?

It just cannot be done without treating both alike.

Is the leadership we contribute to the United Nations to be based on military assistance and economic aid, accompanied by secret diplomacy that is as variable as the wind?

This does not satisfy Americans.

Diplomats must never forget that the conduct of foreign policy cannot be alienated from public opinion here in the United States.

Our people are known for their sense of fair play.

They do not believe in the doctrine of expediency, whereby a small nation is pressed to the limit, while a larger nation, guilty of brutal aggression, goes unpunished.

The United Nations can never command the confidence and support of mankind, unless it establishes a consistent policy. And for that, in the present state of the world, it must depend upon just leadership on the part of the United States.

There must be no sanctions against Israel unless similar sanctions are invoked against Egypt, Communist Russia, and India.

Obviously all this cannot be done on the basis of votes and vetoes.

But there is another imperative at work, namely, justice.

What is the rule for them must be the rule for Israel, until such time as there is equal justice for all.

Therefore, Americans oppose sanctions against Israel.

We realize that Israel must withdraw from Egypt, but, in return, must have genuine guarantees that Egypt will not interfere with the passage of Israeli shipping through the Suez Canal and through the Gulf of Aqaba.

Whatever formula is negotiated to achieve these ends, as a preliminary to settlement of the tensions in this area, will be acceptable to the American people provided that no sanctions are brought to bear against Israel.

Otherwise, our Government will ignore the majority opinion of its own people, leading to a loss of confidence in its conduct of foreign policy.

There must be no sanctions against Israel.

#### MARY ANN BARTHOLOMAY—SHE COOKED THE BEST CHERRY PIE IN AMERICA

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased and honored to announce that America's best cherry pie baker is in Washington today. She is Mary Ann Bartholomay, of Henrietta, N. Y., a resident of my Congressional district.

After capturing State and regional awards, Mary Ann just the other day was chosen the winner of the National Cherry Pie Baking Contest in Chicago. She won out over representatives of every other State, Canada, Alaska, and Hawaii. It is a high honor, and from all reports, a well-deserved one.

Mary Ann is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Karl Bartholomay. She is 17 and a senior at Rush-Henrietta High School, where she is preparing to become a home economics major in college. Besides her cooking proclivities, she has been extremely active in 4-H work, with the Youth Fellowship and the junior board of the Henrietta Civic Center.

She is in Washington today, accompanied by Miss Jane L. Merry, 4-H Club agent for Monroe County, to present one of her famous pies to a representative of President Eisenhower. I am sure the President will be most appreciative of this tasty gift.

Mr. Speaker, Mary Ann Bartholomay proves a point I have long contended—that the best cooks in America come from the 38th Congressional District of New York. I am therefore not surprised that this award has come to a resident of that area, but I do want to extend my heartiest congratulations to this queen of cherry pies. I wish her many more years of happiness and success in cooking and in life.

I am also proud to announce that western New York's far-famed cherry indus-

try received recognition recently when H. B. (Pete) Pearson, president of the Alton Canning Co., was elected president of the National Cherry Institute. Mr. Pearson is from Sodus, N. Y., which is, I believe the largest cherry growing township in Wayne County of my district, which is the largest cherry county in New York State. His elevation to this office comes as fitting recognition for his outstanding contributions to the cherry industry.

#### ECONOMY IN THE NATIONAL BUDGET

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks and include a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that there is a great deal of agitation in the country over the matter of the national budget. We know that the Honorable George Humphrey, the Secretary of the Treasury, has been suggesting legislation that will tend to reduce the budget, and the President himself has been making efforts in that direction.

However, in practically every section of the country the agitation for a reduction of the national budget is keeping up.

Mindful of this situation, I consulted with some of the Republican Members from Ohio, and I called a meeting of the Ohio Republican delegation. We met yesterday, February 25, and, after thorough consideration, we adopted resolutions with reference to this important matter. These resolutions, I think, will reflect the sentiment of the Ohio citizens quite generally.

I think this is the first time any sizable group of the House of Representatives has spoken its views on this important matter. The resolution which was adopted carries the signatures of all the Ohio Republican Members and is as follows:

The Ohio Republican delegation in the United States House of Representatives, after careful study and evaluation, has unanimously agreed that a substantial reduction of the \$72-billion budget will be in the best interests of the people of the United States.

It was further agreed that every proposed reduction in the budget, which does not curtail essential services or endanger the security of our country, will be supported.

The action of the Ohio Republican delegation is the first of its kind with respect to the present budget and is in accord with the admonition of President Eisenhower and Ohio's own Secretary of the Treasury, George M. Humphrey, that Congress exercise its independent control over Government spending.

Signers are (by districts):

1. GORDON H. SCHERER.
2. WILLIAM E. HESS.
3. PAUL F. SCHENCK.
4. WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH.
5. CLIFF CLEVENGER.
7. CLARENCE J. BROWN.
8. JACKSON E. BETTS.
10. THOMAS A. JENKINS.
11. DAVID DENNISON.
12. JOHN M. VORYS.
13. A. D. BAUMHART, Jr.
14. WILLIAM H. AYRES.
15. JOHN E. HENDERSON.

16. FRANK T. BOW.
17. J. HARRY MCGREGOR.
22. FRANCES P. BOLTON.
23. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL.

#### PUERTO RICO

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on March 2, 1917, there was enacted into law a bill of far-reaching and paramount importance to the people of Puerto Rico, which bill extended to the people of Puerto Rico United States citizenship. The 40th anniversary of the enactment of that very important and far-reaching bill will be celebrated on Saturday next. As the House will not be in session on Saturday, of course, adequate observations and exercises in the House cannot take place on that day. However, it is fitting and proper that this important event should not pass this year without significant notice.

I therefore, Mr. Speaker, ask unanimous consent that the Commissioner of Puerto Rico, Dr. FERNÓS-ISERN, be permitted to address the House on Monday next for one-half hour and that during such period, if he desires to do so, he may yield to other Members for the purpose of appropriate celebration of this very important event.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

#### DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1958

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5189) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 1 hour, one-half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] and one-half by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 5189, with Mr. PRICE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, we have with us again today the appropriation bill for the Department of the Interior, H. R. 5189. The budget request submitted this year for 1958 was in the amount of \$515,189,700. The appropriation for 1957 was \$458,135,000. The committee recommends \$454,395,700 for 1958, \$3,739,300 below the bill last year and \$60,794,000 below the budget request.

I have always made the statement when I have spoken on this bill that, if I had my way, the bill would be for \$1 billion or \$2 billion. I meant it then and I mean it now, because the people of this Nation have robbed and looted this great country down through the centuries since the white man first put foot in it. And we are paying the penalty today.

We have lost our oil in eastern Pennsylvania. We have lost our soil from erosion, and so forth. Let us stop and think for a moment of the many millions of acres of land in Alaska, only 1 percent of which has been surveyed. We do not even know what we have in Alaska.

Like everyone else I believe today—and I mean today—we need economy. I think back on two points in my own life, the first in 1907 when this great country had men in Europe recruiting people to come over here to work. They were recruiting them by the thousands. I remember one July morning in 1907 when I went to work. I want to point out how little they knew about a depression. I was working for the United States Steel Corp. At 7 o'clock in the morning, they sent the men out to work. At 11 o'clock they got a telegram from New York telling them to pay the men off and discharge them. I was one of the very few who were kept at work at United States Steel and I remember that they paid me in scrip. Here was the largest corporation in America, and they did not have enough money to pay an employee in money. That was 1907.

I remember 1929, with the same company, when the general superintendent advised the yardmasters that they should give good service, that there were orders on the books for 5 years. The next day came the crash.

In order to economize, your committee has made every effort to reduce this bill. We have reduced it 12 percent. At the same time I think we have brought in a good bill. We have not made large cuts in such things as land management, soil conservation, water resources, forestry, minerals research, and so forth. That is where the wealth of the country comes from. The \$454 million in this bill represents only \$17 million more than the receipts we are taking in. Had we heeded the warning of the scientists of America in the last century, and developed our resources and protected them, instead of wasting them through the years, we would be much better off today.

The committee has disallowed the \$40 million requested for the nondefense subsidy for tungsten, asbestos, fluorspar, and columbium-tantalum. Take the item of tungsten. The man who owns the second-largest mine in the country comes from the State of Pennsylvania.



His name is Philip McKenna. He is Mr. Tungsten himself. He has five refining plants in this country and is the second-largest producer of tungsten. The mine happens to be in the State of Nevada.

This man came into my office and said if he had to take it to the United States Supreme Court he was going to stop the Congress from appropriating this subsidy. They are tired of accepting money from the United States Government. He said the Government has an 18-year supply of tungsten today. They should be selling enough each year to take it down to a 5-year stockpile. So we have an 18-year stockpile of tungsten.

I want to read a letter that he addressed to Senator MARTIN:

The House Committee on Appropriations refused to appropriate any more money to buy tungsten when the Government stockpile is now at least 18 years' supply at present rate of consumption for all uses in the United States of America. But I was horrified to learn that, despite Senator DWORSHAK's vigorous protest, the Senate Committee on Appropriations approved \$30 million for that purpose. Seventy million will be required. I enclose a graph showing the situation. It has been a boondoggle since 1940. It has cost taxpayers about \$300 million.

Worse than that, it has taken out of use \$300 million of our raw material which would otherwise be available for refining and fabrication into cost-saving tools and machines, for use in industry, which raise our standard of living in time of peace and our industrial potential in time of war. Suppose 96 percent of the leather was in the hands of the Government while many people went without shoes? Many people go without efficient tungsten carbide tools and appliances by which we may compete with the world because the Government has obtained and sterilized so large a proportion of the tungsten.

Monday I believe there will be a debate in the Senate on the subject of the appropriation to continue buying tungsten by appropriating \$30 million for that purpose when the Government already has 18 years' supply. They should sell it, 5 percent every year, until it is down to 5 years' supply.

It harms our industries in Pennsylvania that we cannot use tungsten more generally so that our efficiency is good and able to compete. It harms the coal mining industry, the people in many States, to appropriate any more money for buying tungsten not needed for national defense and which would otherwise be used for improving our conditions in competitive private industry.

As you know, I have been in this business since I was a child; my father started the first good tungsten mine in 1900 in Colorado and we in Pennsylvania made the tool steel from it.

I speak as a tungsten miner, because I got the Nevada Scheelite Corp. started 6 years ago as a wholly owned subsidiary of our Pennsylvania company; but nevertheless I do not want to be subsidized despite the fact that it has been profitable, moneywise, to mine tungsten that went into the stockpile. I speak as an expert, qualified by 50 years of experience and more years of my father's experience in the mining, refining, and fabricating of tungsten. My company makes 25 percent of all the tungsten carbide alloy used in the United States of America. I speak as a taxpayer, both in Pennsylvania, and as a Federal taxpayer.

I realize that you may not know how silly it would be to appropriate any more money to buy tungsten when we have 18 years' supply. If you believe in my honesty and integrity, as well as my wisdom in this mat-

ter, you will voice your opposition to wasting any more money of the taxpayers in that boondoggle.

I could write 100 pages about it. But I should not impose upon your time to that extent.

I am responsible for 1,600 folks that work in our business. I am responsible for 14,000 concerns all over the United States of America that depend upon our products. I am acquainted with many military and atomic secrets of which I cannot write you. To the best of my knowledge and belief nothing but harm will come from appropriation of further funds to carry on an unnecessary activity of the Federal Government in taking more of our tungsten into an unnecessary stockpile.

Naturally you will realize all this without my having written you. But I want you to know that I depend upon you as our Senator to oppose further waste. Please oppose that by voting against further money for buying tungsten.

That is just one of the letters. The other tells the same story. A third one came along. Yet we received a budget estimate to appropriate another \$40 million in this bill. I am not blaming those down at the Department. The authorization came before the House last year under a suspension of the rules. There were no hearings printed on it. It went through the House without debate and then passed the Senate. That is the history of it. The Department did not make much of an effort to defend it, and again I say, I am not blaming them. They know it is not needed, but the Congress insisted on authorizing this tungsten stockpiling.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. If I understood my friend correctly, he stated that there is at present a stockpile sufficient to last 18 years.

This morning we were advised by one of the members of the administration, whom my friend quotes in his report, that there are less than 6 years' supply in the stockpile for any objective for which the stockpile has been proposed. How does the gentleman reconcile those two statements—one from Dr. Flemming himself, and the other from the chairman of this committee?

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Kenna states that 1 pound of tungsten today is equal to what 60 pounds was up until 1940 when he made a certain invention. He said we are working under the old rule, and do not know that this invention is in effect.

Mr. ASPINALL. But this statement was made by the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization.

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes; but the man that was the head of ODM when this bill was passed last year said there was no defense justification for the subsidy program.

Mr. ASPINALL. I have no quarrel with the statement made by my friend, because he quotes Dr. Flemming correctly in that respect. The one question I have is how there could be such a variance as to the amount in the stockpile. This act was not passed in order to increase the stockpile quantity.

Mr. KIRWAN. Let me just finish this letter:

Our company mines, refines, and fabricates tungsten carbide. We are one of the nine companies which received 87 percent of the payments through our Nevada Scheelite Co. in Nevada.

He is one of the biggest mine owners in Nevada, and he does not want it.

But I see no continued prosperity in Government buying. On the contrary, they should sell the surplus until they get down to 5 years' supply, which is plenty for any war emergency.

Mr. ASPINALL. There is no contradiction in that respect, but I wish to know how there could be this wide variance from the man who is supposed to have made both statements.

Mr. KIRWAN. The man in charge now has been there only about 2 weeks, but I am referring to "Mr. Tungsten" himself in the actual producing of it. If he does not know, who does know?

Mr. ASPINALL. On page 4 of the report there is this statement:

The committee is advised that some of these large producers are selling the production of their domestic mines to the Government at the subsidy program price of \$55 a unit and purchasing foreign tungsten for use in their own industry at the United States market price of \$35.

The gentleman from Colorado has gone through the hearings completely and he finds no statement by any witness that would substantiate that statement made in the report.

Mr. KIRWAN. The President of the Tungsten Institute in the hearings before the Senate last year when the question was asked, "Do you use any of your own tungsten?" said, "Not a single pound." He admitted that it is all sold to the Government, and that the big processors buy their product from foreign countries. That is the president of the Tungsten Institute who said that.

Mr. ASPINALL. Does the gentleman have any evidence of one group or any company that has engaged in this practice since this act went into effect?

Mr. KIRWAN. If the president said that they were not even buying 1 pound of their own production, who else could be better qualified to make the statement than the president of the Tungsten Institute.

Mr. ASPINALL. But it is not in the hearings.

Mr. KIRWAN. It is in the Senate hearings on the authorizing bill.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. BUDGE. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in the other body and in the hearings shows one such company, the Union Carbide Co. That was mentioned on the floor in the debate in the other body last year.

Mr. ASPINALL. Would my friend yield that I may ask a question of the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. BUDGE]?

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes; then I must continue for I do not have much time at my disposal.

Mr. ASPINALL. Is the gentleman speaking of Union Carbide as such or Union Carbide Nuclear?

Mr. BUDGE. I do not recall which corporation, but I think the gentleman will recall that the Kennametals Co. which the distinguished chairman of our committee has been quoting has been taking exactly the same position. That is the information we have received in the committee.

Mr. KIRWAN. We have allowed \$1,308,000 for tree planting under Clarke-McNary, an increase of \$308,000 over 1957. We have disallowed the \$4 million for the new tree planting program under section 401 of the Agricultural Act of 1956. Under the soil bank program the Forest Service in 1957 and 1958 is receiving an allotment of \$16,550,000 for tree planting—\$10 million this year, plus the \$6.5 million in 1958.

Now, I want to say a word about this tree planting program and yet I do not want to be taken as being humorous. Under the soil bank program alone they expect to plant 5 billion trees; that is what they are working on, 5 billion trees. We had a tree-planting program once before and we are embarking upon another one now as we widen existing highways and put in additional ones. But it seems to me if we are going to plant up to 5 billion trees a year we ought to begin training guides, for you will have to have a guide to take you through the forest of trees in order to find the local Safeway or other chain stores.

Under section 401, the new program is set up to be a matching program with the States, but we do not know yet whether the States will accept or how far they will go. So until we can determine that we have cut the \$4 million out.

Last year a question was asked on the floor of the House by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross]. He is an alert and a good Congressman. He asked the sponsor of the bill reorganizing the Fish and Wildlife Service how many employees it would take and received the answer that it would not take over six. Yet this year this department comes in and requests an increase of over \$900,000 for administrative overhead, an increase of over 100 percent.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a slight correction?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. The response was that it would take 10 or 12 additional employees, yet this year I understand they requested \$900,000 from your committee for this reorganization, which was supposed to provide for greater efficiency and economy.

Mr. KIRWAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GROSS. And if the gentleman will yield another moment I want to commend you, Mr. KIRWAN, and your committee most heartily for refusing the huge increase that was sought, and telling these people to come back with detailed information in support of their request for \$900,000 or any part of it.

Mr. KIRWAN. And I thank the gentleman. He will remember that I said he was alert and a good Congressman, and I mean that sincerely.

I wish to again emphasize that we have cut this bill by 12 percent, and I am asking the Members present today to support the committee. If there is any

motion made on the floor to restore this item for the purchase of tungsten, turn it down because we have got enough tungsten in the Government stockpile to last for 18 years. What do you think John Taxpayer is going to say and do when he learns that we are paying out a subsidy of \$20 a unit to put tungsten in a pile when we have so much there already?

We have heard about the millions it takes to build airplanes and they have tried to justify the cost on the ground that in the next war the nation that strikes first will win it, that after the first blow the war will be over. If the next war is going to come to an end that fast why should we buy more tungsten when we already have an 18-years' supply? Do not overlook that.

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. WESTLAND. I certainly subscribe to the thoughts of the chairman of the committee in supporting his committee's action in cutting these budgets. I appreciate what the committee has done in this regard in this program. I see one item however for a very small amount, \$25,000 for the functioning of the National Monuments Commission, which item was omitted, and I am real disappointed that it was not allowed. Congress has authorized this Commission to draw up plans and specifications for a structure symbolizing the ideals of democracy and freedom. The President has appointed a member of this Commission, the Vice President and the Speaker of the House have likewise appointed members to this Commission. This Commission held its first meeting in January of 1956 in pursuance of that authorization, yet so far as I know they have never been provided with any funds to carry out what the Congress authorized them to do. I am not going to make any appeal to reinstate such a small item as this, but I wish merely to say that I am disappointed that the committee saw fit to leave these funds out of the bill.

Mr. KIRWAN. We left that out, as the gentleman from Washington states, but the committee thought the request should be denied. We may be wrong in our judgment. This would be a wonderful monument, but there is this Capitol, there is Washington Monument, and the Lincoln Monument. This new monument would cost millions, yet they are hollering about balancing the budget. It is not just the item of \$25,000. I have never seen a group of architects or engineers in my life, especially when it comes to spending the Government's money, that are not for building the finest monument in the world.

Mr. WESTLAND. I agree with the gentleman. However, it is my understanding the actual cost of construction of this monument would be through public donations and it would not be a charge against the Federal Government.

Mr. KIRWAN. I would like to see just one building in Washington put up the way the gentleman is talking about. They talk about many of them that will be put up through public donations but it always costs the Government money. It happened to be on the Public Build-

ings and Grounds Committee when the Pentagon Building was planned. At that time General Somervell said it would not cost more than \$24 million. It finally cost \$88 million.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman from Washington and the gentleman from Colorado who is now speaking are members of this Commission to which the gentleman from Washington has just referred. The question I wish to ask the distinguished gentleman from Ohio is this: Would the gentleman approve an appropriation in the approximate amount of \$25,000 provided there was a showing of the expenses that have been incurred by this Commission when there is a report filed by the Commission in accordance with the authorization passed by the Congress. When that report comes before the Congress as a report it can either be approved or disapproved by the Congress. There could be a further provision in such piece of legislation that there are to be no more funds for which the Federal Government will have assumed liability—

Mr. KIRWAN. They have already spent the money?

Mr. ASPINALL. If the money had been money spent by members of the Commission, acting in accordance with the provisions of the authorizing legislation?

Mr. KIRWAN. We have a code on that. They are not allowed to spend money in advance unless it is appropriated.

Mr. ASPINALL. Will the gentleman tell us what is to protect any civilian serving on these commissions, which are authorized by the Congress and by the Executive, in connection with expenses which they incur doing the work they are authorized to do and that they are in fact commanded to do?

Mr. KIRWAN. The answer is, Do not incur any expenses until an appropriation takes place. That is very simple. The code is there. It is prescribed in the Antideficiency Act. We have turned this item down twice before.

Mr. ASPINALL. Then it is the position of the gentleman that any money that may have been spent by members of the Commission in the performance of their duties should not have been spent until the gentleman's committee has appropriated the funds?

Mr. KIRWAN. Let me explain it this way. A Commission was authorized to plan the new civic auditorium. We appropriated no money but they went ahead and spent some. We turned down their request and told them if they came in here in the right way, that we would reconsider. They stopped work and came in with an appropriate request which we granted.

The public has awakened to the fact that a \$72 billion budget has been requested for 1958. And, there are many things needed in this country today, so that I think we could get along without another monument. I again repeat, we already have the Jefferson monument,



the Lincoln monument, and the Capitol dome, and we can do without another one until we see better days.

Mr. ASPINALL. Then let me suggest that some of us should be more careful in accepting assignments from the House of Representatives and the other body understanding at the time of our acceptance that we are following the legislative mandate of Congress and the Executive, and later finding that our work has been for naught.

Mr. KIRWAN. It has not been for naught. You did not get the appropriation, and you have no right to go on doing any work without it. The gentleman would not go out and work for some private concern if they did not have the money.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WIER. While you are discussing the monuments and other governmental buildings here, has the money been appropriated up to this time for the taking over of three or four Blackstones, the Congressional Hotel, and others?

Mr. KIRWAN. I could not tell you.

Mr. WIER. Where is the money coming from? I have never seen any authorization for it.

Mr. KIRWAN. I could not tell you.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, at the outset of my remarks, I want to say that I am in perfect agreement with our chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], regarding the tungsten issue. I am sure that I can speak for every member of the committee when I say that the committee was unanimous in the action we took regarding that item. Certainly, as the chairman said, if we had approved this appropriation request for tungsten and somebody in the Congress or out of the Congress learned the facts about the matter, they would have laughed our committee off the floor today, for by no stretch of the imagination can anyone who knows the facts approve such a request.

With respect to this bill, the budget request was for \$515,189,700. The committee reduced that amount by \$60,794,000. Now, in this bill you will find that there is \$3,739,300 less for 1958 than was allowed for fiscal 1957. We reduced the budget request by 12 percent, and we reduced where we felt reductions were in order.

There are some things in this bill that are very important; many things, as a matter of fact. There are 24 bureaus and agencies all dealing with matters of great concern to the American people. There are 70 appropriation items in this bill, and again they are broken down into many smaller items.

It is a far-reaching and important bill for America. We have under the departments of Government dealing with the public domain in this bill 771 million acres of land, on the mainland and in Alaska—771 million acres of land of the public domain, land that is owned by the Federal Government, by the people of America.

We have many problems to cope with that pertain to these public lands. For instance, the Bureau of Land Management has approximately 180 million acres under its jurisdiction. Ten years ago we were appropriating the large sum of one-half cent an acre, or almost one-half cent an acre, for soil and moisture conservation on those 180 million acres of the public domain. The committee has gradually brought that expenditure up to 2¼ cents per acre. And yet we have people who think that we are spending too much money for soil and moisture conservation on the public domain. We spent such a small amount in the past that wind erosion and water erosion have taken their toll no end on these public lands. We should be spending much more on water and soil conservation. But with a budget of over \$71 billion, the committee felt that it was necessary not to increase but to reduce wherever we could.

I am sure that the American people, generally speaking, who know the problems that we have in this committee as they pertain to all our natural resources, would like to spend much more than we are spending today for the preservation, the conservation of our natural resources, our mother earth, our resources under the ground, and our timberlands. The timberlands are under the Forest Service that now comes under the jurisdiction of this committee.

But because of the fact that we are spending so much money for other things, many of which I am sure should not take priority over the conservation of our natural resources, we feel it is necessary to hold down expenditures for this very important Department of the Interior and the Forest Service, to the point that we have done so.

For instance, the request of the Bureau of the Budget was for something like 2,000 more employees than they have at the present time.

The committee went through each one of those requests with a fine-tooth comb. We reduced that request by 1,300 employees, yet there are more employees in this bill for the Department of the Interior and the Forest Service than there were in the fiscal 1957 bill.

I just heard a little colloquy on the floor of this House where one Member said that there was an authorization for \$25,000 to be spent for a Monument Commission. We have heard that story so long. We have heard fine, able conscientious Members of Congress stand on this floor when an authorization bill was before this body and say, "This is just an authorization bill, this is not an appropriation bill. The Appropriations Committee will yet have an opportunity to operate on this bill. Maybe they will not give anything."

However, the facts are, as history records and as the records show, that 99 times out of 100 the Congress appropriates the money to support an authorization bill. Many times that authorization bill should never have been brought to the floor of the House.

There is the Fish and Wildlife Service. Last year it asked for an authorization to establish a separate department for

commercial fisheries, and the Congress authorized it. Then they bring in a request in this budget for in the neighborhood of \$900,000 to support that new department of the Fish and Wildlife Service. The committee has allowed what it felt necessary to start an organization, but we did not allow enough to go absolutely head over heels into the expenditure of funds to establish a complete organization of regional offices, district offices, and a great body of people here in Washington, D. C., to administer that department. That is the one the chairman just spoke of a minute ago and about which the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] talked.

In conclusion, may I say a word about a member of this committee who has done yeoman service in the field of mines and mining. That Member is the Honorable Dr. FENTON, of Pennsylvania, who grew up with the mines, so to speak, and who has had the responsibility on this committee to see to it that mines were properly taken care of and that the laws were lived up to.

I venture this statement, that no man in America has done more for the mining industry and for the safety of mining than our fine and able colleague, Dr. FENTON, of Pennsylvania. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] I am sure will tell you that the committee puts complete trust in Dr. FENTON's judgment as far as mines and mining are concerned, and to a very great degree on other matters pertaining to this committee.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good bill. I only wish that our fiscal condition in America today was such that we could justly spend more, but such is not the case. This committee has done as good a job as we possibly know how, under present conditions, and I hope the House will approve this bill unanimously.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON].

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, first of all I want to compliment our subcommittee chairman, Mr. KIRWAN, for the fine, impartial manner in which he handled our subcommittee hearings and his presentation today.

It has been a pleasure to work with him as well as with the other members on this subcommittee—regardless of political affiliation.

The experience of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], the ranking minority member of this subcommittee and its former chairman, together with that of our chairman, Mr. KIRWAN, is invaluable to the rest of us.

The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL] is also a long-time member of the committee, and his advice and guidance is always appreciated.

Mr. SIEMINSKI, of New Jersey; Mr. MAGNUSON, of Washington; and Mr. BUDGE, of Idaho, are the younger men who make up the committee. Their contributions in the final analysis of the Interior Department's request for funds are appreciated.

Our staff assistant, Eugene Wilhelm, was especially wonderful to the subcom-

mittee members and has been, as usual, the real workhorse for this subcommittee.

I must also pay my respects to our former staff assistant, Mr. Carson Culp, who has taken over the job of staff assistant to another subcommittee, and who assisted Mr. Wilhelm in the handling of this bill. We are indeed grateful to these two fine men for their assistance.

Now, since the previous speakers have covered pretty thoroughly the highlights of the bill, I will not attempt to discuss all the bureaus in the Interior Department.

As a matter of fact, in summarizing the bill, you will note that the Bureau of the Budget recommended an appropriation of \$515,189,700 for fiscal 1958.

The committee allowed \$454,395,700, or a reduction of \$60,794,000—a 12-percent reduction.

The major portion of that reduction is in the refusal of the committee to go along with the mineral acquisition program for tungsten, asbestos, fluorspar, and columbium-tantalum, in accordance with Public Law 733.

The purchase of tungsten, particularly, was discussed during the supplemental appropriation for 1957 a few days ago, when your committee and the House refused to allow a supplemental of \$30 million.

An explanation of this item and the reasons for the committee's refusing to sanction further purchases of tungsten are set forth fully on pages 3, 4, and 5 of our report.

#### GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

The Bureau of the Budget recommended an appropriation of \$38,775,000 for 1958 fiscal year. The committee approved \$36 million for this bureau, which is all inclusive for—

- (a) Topographic surveys and mappings.
- (b) Geologic and mineral resource surveys and mapping.
- (c) Water resources investigations.
- (d) Soil and moisture conservation.
- (e) Conservation of lands and minerals.
- (f) General administration and special purpose buildings.

The work of this bureau is very important, and while there is a cut of \$2,775,000 from the budget estimate, it does represent an increase of \$4,398,000 over the 1957 fiscal year, the current appropriation.

This bureau, like most of the others, is finding it difficult to recruit engineering personnel to take care of their expanding programs. As is indicated in the report, there were 511 vacancies for those positions as of December 31, 1956. In other words, with half of fiscal 1957 gone they were only able to fill 117 out of 628 vacancies.

However, in the face of all these handicaps, this bureau is being called upon to step up its mapping of all sorts from all the Federal Departments and the States.

As usual, the Geological Survey has done a fine job and it has the continued confidence of this committee.

#### BUREAU OF MINES

The budget estimate for the Bureau of Mines for fiscal year 1958 is \$26,633,000, which is \$4,435,950 more than the current fiscal year.

This increase is distributed in 4 principal categories—namely, \$3,712,250 in conservation and development of mineral resources; \$595,700 for health and safety; \$23,000 for construction; and \$105,000 for general administrative expenses.

Broken down by obligations the budget estimate for fiscal 1958 is (a) conservation and development of mineral resources, \$19,575,000; (b) health and safety, \$5,900,000; (c) construction \$23,000; (d) general administrative expenses, \$1,135,000.

Our subcommittee granted the entire request except a reduction of \$875,000 for conservation and development of mineral resources.

This reduction of \$875,000 includes \$210,000 for standby expenses of the plant at Rifle, Colo.; disallowance of 110 new positions, and so forth.

Since the Rifle project is on the Navy oil-shale reserves, the committee is of the opinion that this item should be taken care of in the Navy appropriation, even though the Bureau of Mines does the work.

Because there is considerable difficulty in recruiting engineers and technical men in most of the governmental departments and bureaus, it was felt that the increase asked for by the Bureau of Mines was excessive. The committee therefore disallowed 110 new positions of the requested increase.

The increase asked for in conservation and development of resources was, of course, justified in view of the very fine increase in the research program. It is believed that this modest cut should not interfere with its progress.

#### HEALTH AND SAFETY

Historically, one of the basic missions of the Bureau of Mines is the promotion of health and safety in the mineral industries.

This function of the Bureau of Mines is carried on through programs of safety education, accident-prevention training, development of safer mining methods, proving the safety of equipment and explosives for use in coal mines, and the mandatory inspection of coal mines under the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act.

Since the enactment of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act there has been quite a diminution of fatal and nonfatal accidents.

On January 16, 1957, when the Bureau of Mines was before our committee, it was testified by the new Director, Mr. Ankeny that "We are about to approach a 26-month period without a major disaster, and if we make it in the next 2 or 3 days that will be the record, the longest period in history that the industry has ever operated without a major disaster."

Underground mining is, as you all know, the most hazardous of the mineral industry. It must be carried on under adverse natural conditions, and the hazards range from falling of overhead roof rock, explosive or harmful gases and dusts, restricted working space and il-

lumination, proximity to electric power, dangers of impounded waters, unsafe explosives, and mechanical equipment.

In view of the great hazards and in spite of the exhaustive work that the Bureau of Mines has done to prevent accidents, both fatal and nonfatal, we experienced early this month, February 4 I believe, a major disaster in a coal mine in Virginia and West Virginia, just a few days after the statement of the Director of the Bureau of Mines, Mr. Ankeny, before our committee, that we were about to enter a 26-month period without a major disaster.

In looking over the statistics for the past 20 years you will see that the vast number of fatal accidents ranged from over 1,400 in 1937 to 785 in 1951. You will also note that since 1951 fatal accidents have decreased to 444 last year.

The incidence of fatalities has remained fairly constant since 1953 when there were 461.

It will also be seen that "falls of roof" cause between 50 and 65 percent of the fatal accidents in both the anthracite and bituminous mines.

While we all realize that as long as we have mining we will also have fatal and nonfatal accidents, yet I am of the opinion that a further large reduction can be secured with a stepping up of preventive measures and research.

Cooperation between all concerned—operators, workers, State and Federal Governments—can effect a minimal amount of deaths and maimed people in the United States.

#### NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

The National Park Service people are to be congratulated on the fine work that they have been doing so far this year.

More progress has been made than at any time in the past and mission 66 will accomplish a much desired improvement in our park services.

Some 57 million people are expected to visit the parks in 1957 and 60 million in the 1958 fiscal year.

With virtually all the land acquired for the Independence National Historical Park in Philadelphia and demolition progressing, it is hoped that the project will be completed at as early a date as possible.

#### FOREST SERVICE

Since this Agriculture facility has been placed under the jurisdiction of the Interior Department Subcommittee for Appropriations it has provoked a great deal of interest to our subcommittee.

It calls for the largest amount in appropriations in this bill.

The budget estimate for the Forest Service was \$126,186,000. The committee allowed \$118,456,000, an increase of \$16,945,250 over the 1957 allowance of \$101,510,750 and a decrease of \$7,730,000 from the budget estimate. So that out of this large budget estimate there was a cut of \$7,730,000 which was from 2 sources—\$3,730,000 from forest land management and \$4 million for tree planting which is a cooperative with the various States.

The reasons for the cuts are fully explained in the committee report.



I appreciate the vast amount of work that comes under the jurisdiction of the Forest Service.

The expanded program that they have presented for 1958 is indeed one that will require a great deal of time and energy to fulfill.

They envisage almost as many visitors to the national forests as the national parks which in itself proves the interest in the forests of the average person.

The keeping abreast of a sustained timber yield while cutting billions of board feet each year is indicative of good management. It is to be hoped that reforestation keeps ahead of the allowable cutting.

I have been greatly interested in prevention and proper management of fires in our coal mines. It seems to me that with the terrible and extensive fires taking place in our forests—national and private—that research is very necessary and indeed urgent.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FENTON. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. I wish to compliment the gentleman and the committee of which he is a member for the deletion of the sum for the pilot plant at Rifle, Colo., because of the jurisdictional question involved. I think under the circumstances the committee acted wisely.

Mr. FENTON. I thank the gentleman. Since the Rifle project is on the Navy oil-shale reserve, the committee was of the opinion that this item should be taken care of in the Navy appropriation bill.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE].

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the generosity of my friend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] and regret again to find myself in serious disagreement, not only with him but also with my friend the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

The committee has refused to include in this appropriation bill the money for tungsten and other minerals that likewise were excluded from the urgent deficiency bill earlier this session. The committee in both instances has quoted testimony of the Office of Defense Mobilization in support of and as a basis for refusing this money.

I want to call the attention of the committee today to the fact that Dr. Arthur S. Flemming, Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, appeared before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs this morning and testified in support of this program authorized by Public Law 733. In particular, I called his attention this morning to the language appearing on page 5 of the committee report, as follows:

Proponents of this nondefense subsidy claim that continuing support of these mining industries is necessary to assure a supply in time of emergency.

I asked Dr. Flemming if, as a proponent of this mining program, he subscribed to that statement. He said he did not, and that he had made it per-

factly plain he did not support the continuance of this program as an emergency defense program, but as an interim program, to sustain this vital part of the American economy until the Secretary of the Interior comes up with a promised long-range mining program.

To quote his statement precisely, here is what he said:

It is recognized that our total mobilization program must rest, if it is to succeed, on the foundation of a strong and sound economy.

It is clear that if the industries with which we are dealing this morning are shut down, one segment of our economy will be weakened.

Surely no one can argue that closed down mines filled with water, with miners out of work, can do anything but weaken a segment of our economy.

We felt last year and still feel that it would be unwise for the Congress to permit this to happen in view of the fact that the administration intends to recommend and the Congress to consider, long-term policies that are designed to create a more favorable economic climate for these industries than now exists.

As I indicated last year, we regard this as purely interim stop-gap legislation.

Nevertheless, we feel that it is important for Congress to go through with the policy set forth in Public Law 733 until the long-term policy is developed and enacted into law.

That is the testimony of Dr. Flemming, who is quoted as the basis and authority for the action of the appropriations subcommittee, given this morning, February 26, 1957, before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. BUDGE. I wonder if the gentleman would comment on this statement by the American Mining Congress in its declaration of policy adopted at Los Angeles, Calif., on October 1-4, 1956.

Mr. ENGLE. I know what the statement is and I will comment on it right now if the gentleman wants me to do so.

Mr. BUDGE. It is one short paragraph:

The use of direct subsidies will lead to eventual Government control of industry. The nature of mining requires that the industry make long-range plans, and revocable or stop-gap measures by the Government contribute little to the real problem.

This is a stopgap measure. Will the gentleman comment on that statement?

Mr. ENGLE. That is entirely correct. The idealistic position of the mining industry is it would prefer not to have a subsidy program. That is precisely the point I want to get to and I am glad the gentleman brought it up. They would prefer an adequate tariff.

The plain facts are that if we do not give the mining industry in this country some help, the entire mining industry is going to close up. That is the problem faced by the administration and that is why they recommended Public Law 733. That is why the Congress last time appropriated \$21 million as stop-gap money. It is just as plain as that. My friend from Iowa says that if the public knew about this they would have

a fit. I should like to address my remarks to the gentleman from Iowa.

I looked at the President's budget. I found that the farming industry of this Nation is being subsidized to the tune of \$5 billion which represents about half of the actual profits of the farming people of America. And yet we are told here that \$90 million in total to keep this vital mining industry alive on an interim basis until the administration comes up with a long-range program is somehow morally wrong. I just cannot see it. It takes 5 years to put a mine in production. When this mining industry closes down, we are going to lose it. And, let me say to my friends who are interested in other types of mining, lead, zinc, copper, manganese, and other types not specifically included in this particular public law, if this same program to aid and assist the mining industry is not brought into existence, we will simply not have a mining industry in this country. That is what is involved here today. And, to hear the argument that it is somehow morally wrong to subsidize such a vital industry flies in the face of what our country is doing in many other instances.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further? It was, of course, through my courtesy that the gentleman obtained his time.

Mr. ENGLE. I am very deeply indebted to him and thank him so much for it.

Mr. BUDGE. All of us are very sympathetic toward the domestic mining industry.

Mr. ENGLE. They need something besides sympathy.

Mr. BUDGE. The distinguished gentleman from California is the chairman of the committee which acted upon the authorizing legislation.

Mr. ENGLE. I was the author of the bill.

Mr. BUDGE. I think that the gentleman should, in all fairness to the House, admit that this program touches only a very small segment of the mining industry. Now, the facts of the matter are that of the almost \$15 billion which was spent last fall on this program, 86 percent went to 11 producers; 92 percent went to 18 producers. Now, that is a very small percentage just in this particular segment of the mining industry compared to the overall mining picture.

Mr. Speaker, I include herewith a summary of revised list of tungsten producers participating in Public Law 733 program:

Wah Chang:	
California.....	\$552,622
Nevada.....	819,620
Colorado.....	819,620
Subtotal.....	2,191,862
Union Carbide (Nevada).....	44,902
Union Carbide and Nuclear:	
California.....	1,105,834
Nevada.....	546,755
Subtotal.....	1,652,639
Minerals Engineering:	
Montana.....	1,273,580
Montana.....	447,474
Subtotal.....	1,721,054

Getchell (Nevada).....	\$1,390,150
Nevada-Massachusetts (Nevada).....	1,390,848
Tungsten Mining.....	1,374,945
Bradley Mining (Idaho).....	897,328
Nevada-Scheelite.....	722,616
Climax Molybdenum Co.....	931,738

Subtotal, above (9 producers)..... 12,318,082

New Idria, California.....	280,742
Surcace Mining, California.....	227,941

Subtotal (11 producers)..... 12,826,765

Gabbs Exploration (Nevada).....	186,807
Minerva Scheelite (Nevada).....	118,247
Hillside Mining & Milling (Arizona).....	118,346
Browstone Mining Co. (California).....	110,111
Browstone Mining Co. (California).....	3,223
Palmer & Decker.....	142,921
Cold Spring Tungsten (Colorado).....	100,800
Valley View Mine.....	105,824

Subtotal, above..... 13,713,044

All other..... 1,140,051

Total..... 14,853,095

Nine largest producers received \$12,318,082 or 83 percent of total.

Eleven largest producers received \$12,826,765 or 86 percent of total.

Mr. ENGLE. Will the gentleman let me answer that now?

Mr. BUDGE. But they do not fit these facts.

Mr. ENGLE. The gentleman was very generous and kind to give me the time, and I hope he will let me answer. When we had this program going over a year ago, we had over 750 tungsten producers in this particular program. By reason of this stopgap business, starting and stopping, we practically wiped all of the little fellows down to about 209. The committee report limits it somewhat. The report shows, eliminating duplications, it is down to 177. Well, the fact is that the little fellow cannot stand the gaff. These are not big outfits, in the way we think of bigness in this country; Union Carbide, U. S. Vanadium are the only two that really represent any size. And, as anyone knows who knows anything about mining, it takes a little time and money to get going underground and to get these operations under way. That is why it is so important that they be kept going at this time.

I would like to complete one thought before I yield further. I would like to call the committee's attention to what has happened here. We had policies made by the Congress of the United States and enacted into law, Public Law 733, which said that we intended to continue this mining program for a period of 30 months. And, the industry got its feet under it again, having been pretty well closed down, and started to get ready to operate. Then along came the Committee on Appropriations, and the Congress appropriated last August \$21 million, so the miners went to work, reopened their mines, did the necessary exploration work, got up their crews and started out, and when the appropriation bill came up on the Senate floor last year, the Senate committee said that the \$21 million was inadequate and that a

supplemental request should be filed. So, they started out to produce with this legislative record behind them.

Now, I ask anyone here: Do you think it is fair, after the Congress has stated a policy clearly and explicitly, signed by the President into law, and the Congress has initiated that program to total \$90 million, with an initial appropriation of \$21 million, to then cut them off at the pockets and tell them that it is just too bad that they went out and opened their mines, committed themselves to the construction of mills, hired employees and did exploration work that cost hundreds of thousands of dollars?

I venture to ask my friend the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] what he thinks would happen if the Appropriations Committee abruptly cut off the \$5 billion in the current budget to make subsidy payments of one kind and another to American agriculture—or even to cut a substantial part of the budget request? The howls would go to high heaven. The farmers would contend, with justice, that they had predicated their farming operations in reliance on the announced program not only adopted by Congress but previously appropriated for. I am sure the Appropriations Committee would be quickly informed that it had to keep faith with the farmers. This is exactly the situation in which these miners find themselves, although not as large an industry or as influential a voice politically as that of the farmers.

Mr. Chairman, I assert that this procedure is not only against the interests of this country, but it is unfair to these mining people who have been imposed upon in this fashion.

My friend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] has referred to a communication which he received from one Philip McKenna. He has called Mr. McKenna "Mr. Tungsten." Mr. McKenna is no more "Mr. Tungsten" than I am. He is a tungsten fabricator and uses about 7 percent of the total tungsten consumed in the country. Furthermore, he is not a tungsten producer. Mr. McKenna opened the Nevada-Scheelite tungsten mine in Nevada when tungsten was \$73 a unit, but he closed it up about 5 months ago. He buys tungsten on the open market to make a tungsten alloy called tungsten carbide, which sells for \$15 a pound and has a tariff protection of \$2.15 a pound. Is it any wonder that Mr. McKenna is advocating that the tungsten stockpile be dumped on the market so that he can buy his raw material very cheap and continue to sell his tungsten carbide at a high price protected by the tariff? Mr. McKenna does not speak for the tungsten miners of this country. He is not a producer of tungsten but is a tungsten fabricator and holds the same position with reference to the tungsten producers as the jewelry fabricators hold with reference to gold, or the clothing industry with reference to the wool producers. Mr. McKenna, like all of these others, wants to get his raw material at the lowest possible price in order to make the highest possible profit. I am sorry that my friend, the distinguished chairman of this subcommittee, has been misled by this correspondence in this fashion because Mr.

McKenna no more represents the tungsten miner than the wolf represents the sheep.

In conclusion, I would like to point out again, as I did when the urgent deficiency bill was before this House, that Public Law 733, continuing on an interim nondefense basis the production of tungsten and these other minerals, had the support of all the executive agencies that studied the situation—Interior Department, the Bureau of the Budget, the Office of Defense Mobilization, and, finally, that of the President himself who signed the bill. Additionally, this legislation was passed last July without opposition through both this House and the Senate and the initial appropriation of \$21 million was approved by both the Appropriations Committee and by the House and the Senate. It is mystifying to us to find the opposition with which we are now faced. One further quotation from Dr. Flemming, the Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, in his testimony this morning before the Senate Interior Committee, will serve to show how emphatic he is in his belief that this money should be restored and this mining program should go forward:

It seems to me that the Government could be put in a ridiculous situation. Forget the defense angle for a moment and let us assume that the Congress approves a long-term nondefense policy which is designed to improve the economic climate and make it possible for these industries to be an integral part of our economy; if they are already shut down the long-term policy does not become very meaningful at that particular point.

From the defense point of view, there is always a possibility of a shift in requirements and if we have a going concern we can adjust to that shift in requirements. That is why I have personally felt that this just made good sense on the part of Government and a contrary policy would not be a commonsense policy to follow under the circumstances.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the Delegate from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT].

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, first of all I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], the chairman of the committee, and my friend, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], and other members of the committee for the generous treatment accorded Alaska in this bill.

I should like to ask the chairman a question or two, if I may, in reference to it. Is it not true that the committee allowed Alaska all of the budget request except a comparatively small item for painting the governor's mansion at Juneau?

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes; the committee, I think, treated Alaska very well and, as the gentleman stated, approved everything requested by the budget.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I might say that I was especially pleased that the Bureau of the Budget's request of \$6 million for Alaska public works was granted. That program has had permanent beneficial effects and I am glad, too, the committee noted in the report that half of that money is to be repaid by the people of Alaska.



I should like to say in connection with the section of the report dealing with the Alaska Railroad Revolving Fund that it is stated that a gas line may be built from Gubik in the Arctic which may diminish the receipts of the Alaska Railroad. In the first place, I would say that that gas line, when and if built, will be constructed by private capital and it is our hope and belief, if that is done, that cheap fuel will create an industrial establishment there that will, in fact, aid the railroad.

I should like to ask the chairman, if I may, about the Bureau of Sports Fisheries and Wildlife. The report says that the Bureau of the Budget had requested 25 percent of the Pribilof Islands seal receipts be used for commercial fisheries and it was the committee's decision that that should be divided between that bureau and the one having to do with sports fisheries and wildlife. I should like to ask the chairman why that was done.

Mr. KIRWAN. That was done to protect the wildlife, because, with the Armed Forces there now, the wildlife there is going the same route that the buffalo went years ago in this country. That is why we gave 12½ percent to the commercial fisheries and 12½ percent to wildlife.

Mr. BARTLETT. Personally, I applaud the committee's action because there are fewer game wardens in Alaska now than in some of the smaller States of the Union and if the game resources are to be protected, we are going to have to put more money in it.

Mr. KIRWAN. Alaska is about one-sixth of the size of the United States and they have fewer game wardens there than they have in Rhode Island.

Mr. BARTLETT. And the responsibility is entirely that of the Federal Government?

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes.

Mr. BARTLETT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I think Congress should look closely at the history of our tungsten and strategic metals purchase program before approving this bill which, unless the Senate takes a different view, will close out much of our domestic tungsten-mining industry.

The domestic tungsten industry came into being to meet a critical shortage in this vital metal at the start of the Korean war. Prior to that time, we had no domestic production to speak of.

With the outbreak of the Korean war, we found many of our sources cut off. South Korea, itself a major source of tungsten, was in turmoil. American soldiers were stationed around Korean tungsten mines to protect the output of tungsten.

The Nation also searched the world for this vital metal, and watched the price double, then triple as foreign sources boosted prices to all the market

would bear. We had to have the metal, so we paid the price.

In the process, however, we learned how important it is to have domestic sources of raw material needed for defense. As a result, this Nation offered to buy domestic ore for \$63 per ton. Under this stimulus, a new industry came into being, an industry that now affects the welfare of some 60,000 people. As a result of the investment in domestic mines, tungsten no longer is in short supply. Foreign sources, many of them subsidized by our tax dollars, have cut prices. The Government purchase price for domestic tungsten has dropped to \$55 per ton. All this is a direct result of the investment, initiative and know-how of our domestic tungsten miners and refiners.

Now, the House Appropriations Committee is asking us to abandon our domestic tungsten industry. The squeeze no longer is on. We are at what is called peace. The price of foreign-produced tungsten is only \$35 per ton, instead of \$90 which was the price the Government was forced to pay when we had no domestic tungsten industry. So, just as we are about to become independent of foreign sources, we decide to close down our domestic mines, abandon expensive mining investments and tell our American producers to go into some other business.

Can we be so gullible as to believe that we can again depend upon foreign sources if the going gets rough? Will they continue to sell at \$35 per ton when we need the metal and must have it at any price?

I think not. If we were to approach this solution from the standpoint of the Nation's best interest, we would protect our domestic mines and keep them operating by putting an adequate tariff on tungsten. If there is overproduction of this vital metal, let it be mines in French Morocco that make the adjustment.

It seems foolish and shortsighted to cut domestic production and return to the situation as it was at the outbreak of the Korean war. The administration was being pound-wise, not penny-foolish, when it asked for a temporary extension of our tungsten purchase program until a long-range mineral policy can be formulated. The House Appropriations Committee, in not following the President's advice, not only threatens to wreck an important domestic industry but leaves us once again to the mercy of foreign producers.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Chairman, I have the highest regard for my good friend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] and I regret exceedingly that I find myself in disagreement with him and the other members of the committee concerning their actions relating to the defense minerals purchase program. As I explained to the House a few days ago when the emergency supplemental appropriations bill was being considered, we in southern

Illinois produce approximately 50 percent of all domestic fluorspar and the failure to allow funds with which to continue this program will be disastrous to the entire fluorspar mining industry. Our operators have spent a considerable amount of money preparing their mines for operation under the assumption that the Government would continue its program as indicated by the passage of Public Law 733.

There are many reasons why this program cannot afford to be stopped. I will not take the time of the House to enumerate the many reasons, but instead refer anyone who is interested to my remarks appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on page 1542 under date of February 5. Surely the Congress is not going to break faith with those producers who have done much and will continue to do all they can to insure that this country has an adequate supply of defense minerals. My friend the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE] has given a very forthright and clear statement concerning the true facts surrounding this controversy. As he has told you, Dr. Arthur Flemming, Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, testified in the Senate committee this morning that this program is needed. I believe he is in a position to know.

I urge my colleagues to give this matter very serious thought as it means not only providing this country with an adequate supply of defense minerals, but in my district alone in southern Illinois where we have 30,000 able-bodied men and women unemployed, it will mean a further loss of 500 jobs if these funds are not restored and the program continued. This, we cannot afford.

There is one question to which my constituents are demanding an answer: They want to know why very few people raise their voice when millions are sent to foreign countries but find strong opposition such as this to a program that not only will help preserve an adequate defense, but help thousands of needy miners in this country. Would you deny your child a loaf of bread and give it to a stranger down the street? That, too often, seems to be the case with a lot of our domestic programs.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. BARING].

Mr. BARING. Mr. Chairman, it is practically impossible to say what I want to say in the short time available to me, but I have to go on record as opposing the action of the Committee on Appropriations. Once again, I want to state that we of the West who are most concerned with this action of the committee were denied the right to come before the committee to testify, as was the case 2 weeks ago, when the urgency deficiency bill came up. Again when I called the Committee on Appropriations, the clerk who answered the telephone told me he could give out no information though he knew I was a Congressman. On such a vitally important subject, I think that the particular segment of our economy should have been given a chance to come before the committee to tell the need of this appropriation. I still cannot believe that the House committee would so com-

pletely reverse itself with regard to the tungsten program after it had become law last year. Their action has shattered the faith of the public toward Congress. Assurances were given to producers by public law, who in turn laid out operational programs and expended funds for development and operation and found themselves suddenly cut off. The tungsten industry was turned on and off like a water spigot. Does not the committee understand that, if this segment of our economy is ended and a national crisis arises, these mines will be filled with water and it will be impossible to produce tungsten except by opening new mines, which takes 4 to 5 years for each mine? Producers and the miners who work for them are being taxed like everyone else for foreign aid, which moneys help produce the foreign tungsten, but their support at home is cut off. How can they pay taxes if their work is shut down?

The deficiency bill came up here 2 weeks ago and most of us spoke at length in behalf of the minerals program. We stated our reasons at that time for believing that for the purposes of national defense and for other reasons tungsten is one of the most important minerals. Now this tungsten program is a national defense issue. This very morning Dr. Arthur S. Flemming, former Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, stated upon my questioning that he knew of the research now going on in various defense laboratories which shows that by putting 15 percent more tungsten into the alloy that goes into a jet motor that such alloy can withstand a temperature of 2,000° F.; there is even a possibility of raising this figure to 3,000°. There is no other metal that can withstand this degree of temperature.

I asked Dr. Flemming this morning about Public Law 733 and he replied:

We feel that Public Law 733 is sound public policy at this time. Congress should go through with this until a long-term policy is developed.

I asked him if he could answer this question, without revealing any classified information:

When we know we are using more tungsten all the time, could a world crisis come about whereby the bulk of our present tungsten could be swallowed up quickly for national defense?

Mr. Flemming replied:

We are better off if the industry is a going concern rather than shut down \* \* \* that is why we came to the Congress and said that we felt that in order to keep these mines as going concerns until a long-term policy was approved that it would make good sense for the Congress to adopt this interim stopgap policy which would insure the continuation of these industries until a long-term policy was approved. Between now and the time the long-term policy is enacted by Congress (these world conditions) may be translated into actual requirements and that may change the national defense picture. If it does, we can adjust to it. The industry is there and we can acquire it, if it is necessary to do so, but if these mines are shut down and flooded with water, etc., if we decide that we have to acquire additional supplies, we would spend far more money than is involved in this issue at the present time.

Mr. BARING. I wish to quote here from the Senate hearing this morning: "If Public Law 733 is carried out, then you can quickly change and get your requirements?"

Dr. FLEMING. This is right.

Mr. BARING. But the danger is that the mines will be closed and flooded and possibly at lot of miners—like in my own State, some 3,000 miners are affected—would clear out of the regions and the mines would go to pot.

Dr. FLEMING. It seems to me that the Government could be put in a ridiculous situation. Forget the defense angle for a moment and let us assume that the Congress approves a long-term nondefense policy which is designed to improve the economic climate and make it possible for these industries to be an integral part of our economy; if they are already shut down the long-term policy does not become very meaningful at that particular point.

From the defense point of view, there is always a possibility of a shift in requirements and if we have a going concern we can adjust to that shift in requirements. That is why I have personally felt that this just made good sense on the part of Government and a contrary policy would not be a commonsense policy to follow under the circumstances.

I would, for the benefit of the House, like to point out that Mr. McKenna, of whose letter the gentleman from Ohio, MIKE KIRWAN, has made such an issue, is not a producer but a fabricator and is thus more interested in getting cheap tungsten from foreign countries. I would also like to point out the fact to the House of Representatives that the other body has reinstated the money, \$30 million, into the urgency deficiency bill and this action was passed by a 64 to 17 vote showing that two-thirds of the Senate is certainly behind this program.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

The amount appropriated for the Geological Survey shall be available for purchase of not to exceed 125 passenger motor vehicles, for replacement only; reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard service for protection of confidential files; contracting for the furnishing of topographic maps and for the making of geophysical or other specialized surveys when it is administratively determined that such procedures are in the public interest; construction and maintenance of necessary buildings and appurtenant facilities; acquisition of lands for gaging stations; and payment of compensation and expenses of persons on the rolls of the Geological Survey appointed, as authorized by law, to represent the United States in the negotiation and administration of interstate compacts, including not to exceed \$10,000 for the person appointed by the President to participate as the representative of the United States in the administration of the compact consented to by the act of May 31, 1949 (63 Stat. 145): *Provided*, That notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the President is authorized to appoint a retired officer as such representative, without prejudice to his status as a retired Army officer, and he shall receive such compensation and expenses in addition to his retired pay.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I am disturbed by a statement I find on page 244 of the hearings in connection with

the construction of a new building for the Geological Survey. We find this statement made by a Mr. Nolan:

The agreement with the Budget Bureau, the Office of Defense Mobilization, and the General Services Administration was that it would be located within 10 to 15 miles of Washington.

Going on, he said:

We learned indirectly that the Senate committee was reluctant to authorize the project because of the concern that was expressed by District of Columbia people over the effect of the proposed moves of so many agencies and so many people from downtown Washington.

Then he goes on to say:

This is almost a complete reversal, and you remember the proposals that have been made over the past 4 or 5 years that we should move as far away from Washington as possible.

My question is this: Who is running this business of locating buildings in or near the District of Columbia? Is it the Washington Board of Trade? Who are these "people" to whom Mr. Nolan refers? I wonder if some member of the Committee on Appropriations could tell me. This building is probably justified, but I would like to know who is establishing location policy.

Mr. KIRWAN. I think there are probably a half a dozen agencies, and one has to get permission from the other. There is the Planning Commission, and two or three other commissions that all dovetail into each other. One has to get permission from the other before they can do anything. But these are all the results of acts of Congress.

Mr. GROSS. I understand that, but it is—

Mr. KIRWAN. But I am telling you what we have to do. They tell them it should be moved out in the country somewhere. They want to try to get a building in the city, and every time they try it there is objection to it. But the committee itself feels the building should be in the city of Washington.

Mr. GROSS. We have traffic problems in the city of Washington and Congress is continually called upon to build bridges over the Potomac River or tunnels under it. Eventually Congress may be called upon to operate ferry lines over the Potomac in order to move traffic. Why not locate this and other new buildings out to where there is parking space, out where the people who are employed by the Geological Survey can live close to their work.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes; I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JENSEN. I want to say in response to the gentleman's question, the Geological Survey Agency is now located in 19 different places throughout the District of Columbia and a couple of them outside of the District. Now, as the chairman has said, there is always a hassle when the question arises, "Where do you want this building? Do you want it within the District of Columbia or should we move it outside the District?" I might say that the committee has not taken a position on that as yet, but in



the final analysis I can assure the gentleman that before the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Interior Department makes an appropriation to construct this building we will know where the building is going to be built and we will know pretty well the circumstances which surround the problems of traffic, and so on. Some will say "We want that building built outside the District," and perhaps half the people who work for the agency live on the other side of the city. You do not always save money just because you build the building outside the city. There are many people that live in apartment houses within the District who work for the Geological Survey. May I say that because of my high regard for the top officers of the Geological Survey that I would be willing to leave the location to their best judgment.

Mr. GROSS. I appreciate the gentleman's statement, and I prefaced my remarks by saying that I believed a building for the Geological Survey was in order. But certain unidentified people downtown seem to be dictating where the building should go and I would like to know who they are and whether their reasons are purely mercenary.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GROSS was granted 1 additional minute.)

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. LANKFORD. I would like to congratulate the gentleman from Iowa in bringing up this point. I would like to join with him in the statement that I think some of the Government buildings should be moved outside the District of Columbia to alleviate the traffic problems here. In my own district there are a thousand acres of Government land which are lying there idle, and yet every day these agencies buy additional land. We hear they do not want to have an airport at Burke, so they will go down to Belmont Bay and pay \$8 million there to save \$2 million, while we in Maryland have a perfectly good airport, Friendship International, that is just as close as Belmont Bay already in being and thousands of acres of land available.

Mr. GROSS. And if the gentleman will recall it was only a short time ago we were told we ought to adopt a policy of dispersion of buildings in future construction for reasons of national defense. Yet they continue to locate them in the District, in the heart of the target area.

Mr. LANKFORD. The gentleman is absolutely right.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### BUREAU OF MINES

#### CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF MINERAL RESOURCES

For expenses necessary for promoting the conservation, exploration, development, production, and utilization of mineral resources, including fuels, in the United States, its Territories and possessions; and developing synthetics and substitutes; \$18,700,000.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have the greatest respect for the members of the Committee

on Appropriations, and certainly I think we are all concerned in the attempt to reduce the size of the budget and reduce expenditures. I do, however, want to take this opportunity to express on behalf of the people I represent what they feel to be a breach of faith on the part of the Congress of the United States in not carrying on the domestic minerals purchase program. A great many of the people concerned in the production of these minerals proceeded with exploration and development and spent thousands and thousands of dollars because of the passage of Public Law 733. Today they feel very definitely they are being let down and that there has been a lack of faith on the part of the Congress of the United States.

Certainly, as I said, I have the greatest respect for the committee, and particularly for my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio, with whom I have discussed this matter personally. It does not remove from the minds of the people, particularly in the western areas who have expended thousands of dollars, the feeling that they are being abused on the basis of what this Congress did in enacting the law, to develop these mines. They felt they were doing something for the welfare of this country, something that would strengthen the defense of this country. Certainly I cannot let this opportunity pass without calling the attention of my colleagues in the House to what I firmly believe to be unfair treatment of a great segment of our people in the West. Certainly it is my hope that before this session ends, somewhere down the line we will be able to restore the money for this program in order to keep the faith which these people have in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. BARING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield.

Mr. BARING. I would like to point out at this stage that the other body has reinstated the funds that we denied in the deficiency bill.

Mr. SISK. I thank the gentleman, and I certainly hope that in the other body action will be taken to continue the program.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### OFFICE OF TERRITORIES ADMINISTRATION OF TERRITORIES

For expenses necessary for the administration of Territories and for the departmental administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior, including expenses of the offices of the Governors of Alaska, Hawaii, Guam, American Samoa, as authorized by law (48 U. S. C., secs. 61, 531, 1422, 1431a (c)); salaries of the Governor of the Virgin Islands, the Government Secretary, and the members of their immediate staffs as authorized by law (48 U. S. C. 1591); compensation and mileage of members of the legislatures in Alaska, Hawaii, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands as authorized by law (48 U. S. C., secs. 87, 599, 1421d (e), 1431a (c), and 1572e); compensation and expenses of the judiciary in American Samoa as authorized by law (48 U. S. C. 1431a (e)); grants to American Samoa, in addition to current local revenues, for support of governmental functions; and personal services, household equipment and furnishings, and utilities necessary in the operation of the houses of the Governors of

Alaska, Hawaii, Guam, and American Samoa; \$1,965,000: *Provided*, That the Territorial and local governments herein provided for are authorized to make purchases through the General Services Administration: *Provided further*, That appropriations available for the administration of Territories may be expended for the purchase, charter, maintenance, and operation of aircraft and surface vessels for official purposes and for commercial transportation purposes found by the Secretary to be necessary.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and take this time to propound a question to the chairman of the committee. Is it the committee's position that in the allowance of \$25,000 to take care of the audit proposed by the Governor of Guam, it would obviate the necessity of the local government duplicating the same responsibility?

Mr. KIRWAN. The Governor of Guam testified before the committee and said he needed an auditor to make an independent audit. I think that is so.

Mr. ASPINALL. Is this in place of an audit that the legislature might itself authorize or would it be in addition to that?

Mr. KIRWAN. It would be in addition to that. He wants to get his own information as to the standing of the place over there, coming in as a new governor.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### INDIAN CLAIMS COMMISSION

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the act of August 13, 1946 (25 U. S. C. 70), creating an Indian Claims Commission, \$177,700, of which not to exceed \$3,600 shall be available for expenses of travel.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time not to offer any change in the language of this legislation but to express the appreciation which I am sure is in the hearts of many Indian people in this country for the action taken by the committee with regard to funds for the work of the Indian Claims Commission. The work of that Commission has been lagging. It is a problem of which the House Interior Committee is well aware and which we are pleased to see cognizance has been taken of by the Appropriations Committee in providing additional funds.

I hope the Appropriations Committee will follow the very desirable action with regard to this appropriation by insisting that the Department of Justice when it seeks its appropriation will also secure sufficient funds to do the job that it needs to do to bring these cases to issue. Much of the lag that is present in the work of the Indian Claims Commission is due directly to the failure of the Department of Justice to file its pleadings in these cases and to bring these cases to trial.

I think this subcommittee has taken the very necessary first step toward getting this problem behind us, a very necessary problem to be resolved before we can actually have a full resolution of our Indian problems.

If the Committee on Appropriations will just follow up by seeing that the Justice Department also obtains the

money and uses that money to get these cases tried, then I think the Congress will have taken a very, very long step toward a complete solution of the Indian problem. I want to thank the committee for the work done in this regard.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think it should be stated in regard to the Indian Service that in this bill you will see the committee has appropriated the budget request for additional schoolrooms and teachers for Indian children. Appropriation is made in this bill for additional educational facilities for 5,090 Indian children, which means that after this money has been expended in fiscal 1958 school facilities will be provided for every Indian child of school age. Just 4 years ago there were over 15,000 Indian children of school age that were not in school because there were no school facilities or the necessary teachers. Mr. Emmons, Director of the Indian Service, took hold of that situation, and with comparatively little money as against what former directors of the Indian Service said it would take, has done this great job of getting all the Indian children in school and also in establishing schools that will teach children many different kinds of vocations, which will finally bring about the desired situation where Indians will be self-supporting much sooner than has been expected and the Indians will be in a position to be emancipated, so to speak. I am sure I express the sentiments of every member of the committee when I say that we are very happy to compliment Mr. Emmons for the great job he has done in getting the Indian children in school and providing for vocational training which will fit these Indians, not only the children but the adults, to make their own living in this great blessed land of theirs and ours.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I want to join the gentleman in expressing appreciation to Commissioner Glenn Emmons for his leadership in this educational field. I think the program which he in large measure is responsible for, for an expanded educational program, not only for Indian children but for adults as well, is a real milestone in the history of Indian legislation and of Indian programs, and I think the gentleman from Iowa, who has been one of the leaders in the fight for vocational educational programs for our Indian children, is deserving of the appreciation of not only the Indian people but of his colleagues in the House.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the gentleman. May I say that every member of this committee has been very active and greatly interested in the Indian problem, and I have nothing but the highest praise for every member of the committee for a job well done, and we thank every Member of this House who has supported the committee so loyally over the past many years.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. KNOX. I should like to ask the gentleman relative to the educational facilities for Indians, if that is "without exception" through the entire Nation?

Mr. JENSEN. That is right.

Mr. KNOX. Now I come back to a date when the Congress deeded over property which was owned by the Federal Government to the State of Michigan and in doing so the State of Michigan became responsible for the education and institutional care of all Indians in the State of Michigan. Now, the gentleman said this is "without exception," and I am wondering whether it is without exception or whether Michigan is still going to have to continue to care for all of the Indian children in the State of Michigan whether on the reservation or otherwise.

Mr. JENSEN. I do not know how the legislation reads which the State of Michigan passed, but if the State of Michigan passed legislation which provided that it would take over the responsibility of the Indians in your State in toto, then, of course, that holds as a State law. We are happy that your State took such action, and I am sure the gentleman must be proud of his State for taking such action.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House, with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PRICE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5189) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. SMITH of Virginia, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 168, Rept. No. 169), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Education and Labor, effective from January 3,

1957, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct studies and investigations relating to matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee under rule XI, clause 6, of the Rules of the House of Representatives. For such purpose such committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, its Territories and possessions, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents as it deems necessary. Subpoenas shall be issued only over the signature of the chairman of the committee or a member of the committee designated by him; they may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

The committee may report to the House of Representatives from time to time during the present Congress the results of its studies and investigations, with such recommendations for legislation or otherwise as the committee deems desirable. Any report submitted when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House.

#### With the following committee amendments:

That the Committee on Education and Labor, effective from January 4, 1957, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized to conduct a full and complete study and investigation of all matters—

- (1) Relating to employee health, welfare, and pension plans;
- (2) Relating to the question of Federal aid to school construction; and
- (3) Relating to education and labor generally.

For the purposes of such investigations and studies the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, its Territories, and possessions, whether the House has recessed or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents as it deems necessary. Subpoenas shall be issued only over the signature of the chairman of the committee or a member of the committee designated by him; they may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

The committee may report to the House of Representatives from time to time during the present Congress the results of its studies and investigations, with such recommendations for legislation or otherwise as the committee deems desirable. Any report submitted when the House is not in session shall be filed with the Clerk of the House.

Amend the title so as to read: "Resolution to authorize the Committee on Education and Labor to conduct studies and investigations relating to certain matters coming within its jurisdiction."

#### ARMY NATIONAL GUARD AND ARMY RESERVE 6-MONTHS' TRAINING PROGRAM

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.



The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to announce to the membership that the Subcommittee on Armed Services which was considering the dispute of the Army and National Guard has reached a solution of the problem which is satisfactory to all parties. We had a vote this morning in the subcommittee and approved a "memorandum of understanding" which has been worked out with the Army and the Army National Guard Association.

Under the terms of this memorandum of understanding enlistees between the ages of 17 and 18½ will be given 6 months' active field training in the National Guard after the 1st of January 1958. Prior to that time they can enlist in a program of 11 weeks' training, but that program will cease to exist January 1, 1958.

When the 6-months' program goes into effect, the Army agrees to certain programs to assure the strength of the National Guard so we may know that at no time will the strength of the National Guard fall below the level set by the United States Congress which at the present time is 400,000.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Record at this point a short statement which I made before the subcommittee this morning together with a copy of this memorandum of understanding entered into between the Army and the National Guard so that it will be available to all the Members of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to follows:)

Members of the subcommittee, I have called the subcommittee together so that I could submit a memorandum of understanding concerning the Army National Guard and the Army Reserve 6-months training program.

Everyone knows the problems we have had in this regard. The Department of the Army issued a directive on January 19 which requires all National Guard recruits to perform 6 months of active-duty training after April 1, 1957. The Guard opposed the provisions of this directive. The subcommittee held 2 full weeks of hearings on this problem. The subcommittee then authorized the chairman to proceed to negotiate this matter with the Army and the National Guard, in order to see if some area of agreement could not be reached.

I have discussed this problem with virtually every member of the subcommittee and many members of the full committee. I contacted representatives of the Army and of the National Guard Association and discussed the matter at length with both groups.

As a result I can now announce to the subcommittee that a full agreement has been reached with the National Guard Association and the Army.

Practically all of our members agree that 6 months of active duty training should be required of new recruits in the National Guard. The big problem has been to decide when this program should go into effect and how we could assure the Guard that the overall strength of the National Guard would

not be materially decreased after the new program was put into effect.

The members of the subcommittee will find before them a memorandum of understanding. I will have the agreement read in a moment, but I can tell you that this memorandum of understanding settles the two questions which have plagued us for the past 3 weeks. It provides that the 11 weeks' training program advocated by the Guard will go into effect in conjunction with the 6 months training, but the 11 weeks' training program will be discontinued on January 1, 1958. Furthermore, all persons enlisting in the 11 weeks' program must have completed their training by that date. After January 1, 1958, all new recruits in the Guard under 26 years of age will be required to perform 6 months of active duty training.

The agreement assures the Guard that its strength will not decrease below approximately 400,000, or such strength as may be set by appropriations of Congress. There are several ways that this can be accomplished and these are included in the agreement.

In all such matters where there is an honest difference of opinion there must be give and take on the part of all parties, if an agreement is to be reached. Both the Army and the National Guard, in my judgment, have been extremely fair in their approach to this problem and are entitled to high credit for their actions and good faith in attempting to work out an agreement.

If this report is adopted by the subcommittee it should bring to a close an old controversy which has existed between the Regular Army and the National Guard. As a matter of fact, if this memorandum of understanding is agreed to by the subcommittee it can well be considered a basis upon which a new era of good will and understanding between the National Guard and the United States Army will begin, and in the future may be considered as a cornerstone of support for the strongest and most active establishment the Army has been able to maintain in this country in peacetime.

#### MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING REGARDING THE ARMY NATIONAL GUARD AND ARMY RESERVE'S 6 MONTHS' TRAINING PROGRAM

1. Until January 1, 1958, persons between the ages of 17 and 18½ may enlist in the National Guard for 11 weeks of active duty training and the remainder of the unexpired portion of the obligation is to be spent in the National Guard (Ready Reserve), where active participation will be required, provided, persons entering the 11 weeks' training program must have enlisted in such program on a date sufficiently prior to January 1, 1958, to insure completion of 11 weeks of training by January 1, 1958.

2. Persons within the age group 17 to 18½ who voluntarily perform 6 consecutive months' active-duty training will only be required to serve 3 years in addition to the 6 months' active duty for training in the National Guard (Ready Reserve) where active participation will be required. At the end of that period they may be transferred to the Standby Reserve for the remaining 4½ years of their total 8-year obligation. It is understood, however, that these young men may remain in the National Guard, if acceptable, and if they volunteer to do so.

3. Beginning January 1, 1958, all persons enlisting in the National Guard between the ages of 17 and 18½ will be required to perform 6 months of active duty for training, and the 11 weeks' active-duty training course will be discontinued. The Ready and Standby Reserve obligations will be the same as set forth in the foregoing paragraph, 6 months' active duty for training, 3 years Ready Reserve and 4½ years Standby Reserve.

4. Persons between the ages 18½ through 25 enlisting in the National Guard will be

required to perform 6 months of active duty training to be followed by 5½ years' service in the National Guard (Ready Reserve) where active participation will be required.

5. Persons in a deferred status, age 26 and over, who possess qualifications in a technical or scarce MOS, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army, and members of the Alaska Scouts will not be required to undergo active duty for training upon enlistment in the National Guard, but may volunteer to do so.

6. It is agreed that the size of the Army National Guard shall be maintained at an authorized strength of approximately 400,000 for the remainder of fiscal year 1957 and fiscal year 1958, and thereafter at such greater or lesser strength as may be determined in annual appropriations of the Congress, and it is agreed to use every means to maintain the Guard at approximately the determined figure. The Army agrees to provide sufficient spaces in the 6 months' training program to allow the National Guard to reach this figure, taking into consideration the input into the Guard from other programs.

7. Persons enlisting while satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course of high school instruction may have their active duty for training deferred for a period of not more than 1 year in order not to interrupt their high school course of instruction; provided, that persons enlisting for 11 weeks of active duty for training may be deferred from entrance on such active duty for training until their graduation; provided, they will complete their active duty for training prior to January 1, 1958.

8. It is agreed that everything possible will be done to maintain the Army National Guard at its appropriated strength, supra, including the following actions:

(a) Recruitment of persons between 17 and 18½ years of age for either 11 weeks' or 6 months' active duty for training as set forth in paragraphs 1 and 2, supra.

(b) Recruitment of persons age 18 through 25 for the 6 months of active duty for training as set forth in paragraph 4, supra.

(c) Recruitment of persons age 26 through 35 as set forth in paragraph 5, supra.

(d) Nonassignment of prior service personnel to the United States Army Reserve for a period of 60 days subsequent to their release from active duty during which time the Army National Guard shall have exclusive opportunity for recruitment of such personnel.

(e) Recruitment for the Army National Guard will be accomplished by the Regular Army Recruiting Service on the same basis as recruitment for the active establishment and the Army Reserve.

(f) As a last resort, the prerelease of personnel on active duty.

#### INTERNATIONAL PANCAKE DAY RACE AT LIBERAL, KANS.

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, in old England it was customary for the housewives to drop whatever they were doing and hurry to the church at the tolling of the bell to be "shriven" of their sins. In 1445 a wife in Olney, England, started baking her pancakes rather late. They were not quite finished when the church bell rang, but she hurried off to the "shriving" carrying her griddle and pan-

cakes with her. Thus an annual sporting event was born.

In Liberal we heard of this 500-year-old event of pancake racing over a 415-yard course from the town pump to the church, and in 1950 the challenge was accepted by Rev. R. C. Collins, vicar of Olney. In the running of the First International Pancake Day Race over identical courses, times of the winners in both Liberal and Olney were compared by transatlantic telephone.

Mrs. Breeding and I cordially invite the Members of the 85th Congress to attend this world famous celebration in Liberal, Kans., on March 5, 1957.

**LIBERAL, KANS.**—One of the strangest events in the realm of athletics will take place in Liberal March 5 when housewives will run 415 yards through the main streets at 11:55 a. m. flipping pancakes in skillets in a traditional race with the housewives of Olney, England. In the eighth annual such race, Olney housewives will be trying to even the score. Liberal leads, 4 to 3.

It all started more than 500 years ago in England when on Shrove Tuesday, the day before lent, housewives used up accumulated cooking fats before fasting by baking pancakes. Legend has it that one day a housewife baking pancakes lost track of time until suddenly she heard the church bell ring, calling everyone to the shriving service in the church. In her haste she ran to the church, clad in her apron and with her skillet in hand, and this was the first pancake racer.

Other women of Olney in following years, not to be outdone by their neighbors, got into the act. The one who beat the others to the church was kissed by the Verger, and the kiss came to be called the "kiss of peace" and is still the traditional prize for the winner of the pancake race here and in England.

Liberal got into the competition in 1950 after a picture of the Olney racers appeared in a magazine. Liberal jaycees decided that their housewives might be just as fast on their feet as the English women. They dispatched a letter to the Vicar of Olney, who ramrods the race over there, challenging the English to an international race. Vicar Collins quickly accepted and the race was on.

Each year since then on Shrove Tuesday thousands of cheering spectators crowd the streets in each town to watch the apron-clad housewives flit and flip their way merrily down the village streets in this sporting gesture of international good will.

In spite of any temporary diplomatic differences between the United States and England, the race has always been carried out in a spirit of friendly competition and has remained a strong and permanent link of international friendship between the people of the two countries.

In Liberal the race course is over brick and asphalt streets. In Olney the setting is cobblestone streets, thatched-roofed cottages, and the old bull-inn. Both races, according to age-old tradition, end at a church, where the kiss of peace is administered—in England by the church verger and in Kansas by the British Consul. The accompanying whirr of television cameras and the general hubbub of a major celebration are background additions to the traditional kiss, brought on by intense new coverage of the event.

The Kansans are one up on the British now after Mrs. Nina Jordan, 25-year-old gas company employee, ran the cold and slippery 415 yards in 1:14.6 last year to beat the Olney time of 1:15.2. Winning times are compared by transatlantic telephone call.

In the eighth annual race coming up, Mrs. Jordan is expected to defend her title. The

traveling trophy, a griddle engraved with past winners' names, now hangs in the Liberal Chamber of Commerce office for all the townsfolk to see. Approximately a dozen housewives are in training now to prevent the loss of the trophy.

Various methods of training are used, usually under husband's advice, most of the would-be contestants practice running in the later afternoons or evenings. And it is nothing to see a woman running round and round the block where she lives flipping her pancake in a skillet, cheered on by the members of her family.

One more serious contestant in recent years would eat nothing for breakfast but a cereal guaranteed to give you the utmost in pep and energy, and would eat no fats for months before the race. Others give up chocolates and cigarettes or go for long daily walks to build up their wind.

The police were alerted one evening when rural residents saw a man in an automobile apparently trying to run down a woman on the road. As it turned out, she was practicing for the pancake race, in the lights of the car while her husband times her efforts.

Athletic attire is prohibited in the race. Regular housewifely garb of housedresses, paron, headscarf, and oxfords or regular street shoes are required.

The best time ever turned in for the race was 1:05.1 by Mrs. Binnie Dick in 1955. She won the race here three consecutive years, and was international champion twice. After three local victories, a contestant is disqualified.

With a tradition of 500 years of racing behind them, Olney housewives jumped off to a quick lead, winning in 1950 and 1951. Liberal women soon caught on and won in 1952. Olney avenged their loss in 1953, but Liberal girls found the winning combination and swept the 1954, 1955, and 1956 races for a record string of consecutive victories.

Winning times are:

Year	Liberal, Kans.	Olney, England
1950.....	1:18	1:10.4
1951.....	1:14.5	1:12.1
1952.....	1:08	1:10.8
1953.....	1:09	1:07.2
1954.....	1:07.7	1:12.2
1955.....	1:05.1	1:18.5
1956.....	1:14.6	1:15.2

Interest will run high in the March 5 event in both places. Olney will be trying hard to even up the score. Liberal will be trying to chalk up the comfortable margin another win would bring. The whole town is pitching in with feverish excitement making ready for the day-long celebration which accompanies the event. Festivities here include a parade, beauty and amateur contests, dances, and parties honoring the visiting celebrities who crowd into the small town of 10,000 for the unique spectacle. Liberal, not normally well known for its athletics, will shine if pancake racing is ever added to the Olympics.

#### PANCAKE DAY SCHEDULE, LIBERAL, KANS.

TUESDAY, MARCH 5, 1957, PANCAKE DAY

6:45 a. m.: All Civic Club pancake breakfast.

9:30 a. m.: Pancake Day parade.

11:15 a. m.: Kids' Pancake Day race.

11:55 a. m.: International Pancake Day race.

12:15 p. m.: Telephone call to Olney, England.

1 p. m.: Kiddies free matinee—plaza.

1:30 p. m.: Five-State beauty contest.

4:30 p. m.: Fifth annual all-American Pancake Day race.

7 p. m.: Finals of amateur contest, coronation of international, and all-American race winners.

#### NEAR EASTERN POLICY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring before the House the important issues arising out of the President's speech to the country last Wednesday, because it is my firm conviction that these issues need a thorough airing. I hope that at the conclusion of my remarks, as many Members as possible will join in the debate. I propose to yield the floor to any Member for comments after my remarks are completed.

There is something very wrong in the picture of the United States supporting sanctions against a small democracy like Israel. It violates the traditional American sense of fair play. I was amazed that the President of the United States in his speech chose to call Israel an aggressor, as if there had not been justified provocation because of numerous belligerent acts by Egypt. The Arab-Israeli conflict did not begin on October 29. There is a long history of Arab guerrilla warfare and aggression prior to that date, culminating in the self-defense action of Israel. During the Arab invasion at the establishment of the State of Israel in 1947, Israel suffered over 10,000 casualties. Continued aggression by Egypt and other Arab States after the signing of the armistice agreements, for example, took the lives of 100 Israelis and left 132 others wounded in 1951 alone. In fact, from the signing of the armistice agreements to the end of 1955, Israel has suffered 1,293 casualties at the hands of the Nasser-inspired guerrilla armies operating to a large extent from bases in the Gaza Strip. I may add that the Gaza Strip is not Egyptian territory and its Arab inhabitants are not recognized as Egyptian citizens, nor has Egypt ever done anything for these 200,000 refugees. Let it be established once and for all that the action of Israel was wholly an act of legitimate self-defense.

I was equally amazed by a recent statement of one of my colleagues here on the floor of the House that our paramount interest demands that we do not dare to antagonize the Arab nations for fear that this would jeopardize our oil interests. I hope that we will never come to the point when we have to sell our friends down the river for a mess of oil or sacrifice our historic moral principles for the sake of expediency, and when I speak of these moral principles, I want them to be applied in accord with a single standard in all situations.

The double standard of morals at the United Nations is revolting to most Americans. We cannot accept without protest one rule for the strong nations and another for the weak. We cannot ignore the fact that Soviet Russia has defied 11 resolutions dealing with the Hungarian situation. India objects to the United Nations resolution dealing with the Kashmir problem, and I have yet to hear in the United Nations a demand for punitive measures against either of these nations, or against Egypt, which has openly and repeatedly defied the United Nations Security Council



resolution of 1951, calling for a halt to her practice of blockading the Suez against Israeli shipping.

There is a lamentable tendency to gloss over the fact that Israel's insistence upon firm guaranties for the security of its citizens and the freedom of its shipping is the result of belligerent acts by Egypt. The raids of the Egyptian fedayeen and the blockades imposed by Egypt against Israel shipping through Suez and through the Gulf of Aqaba were acts of war openly proclaimed as such by Egypt when she attempted to justify the violation of the armistice agreements to which she had affixed her signature in 1949.

In this perspective, it becomes unthinkable and immoral to speak of imposing sanctions against Israel. If Israel withdrew her troops from the shores of the Straits of Tiren and from the Gaza Strip without adequate guaranties, Egyptian raids would begin once more and the blockade of Aqaba would be restored. It would be far more fitting if the United Nations first obtained from Colonel Nasser a renunciation of his self-proclaimed state of belligerency against Israel, and until Egypt is prepared to enter some satisfactory arrangement, the United Nations should station its emergency force at Aqaba and in the Gaza Strip, so that peace can be maintained along her borders with Israel.

It is manifestly unfair for the United States to continue the economic squeeze which it is presently imposing on Israel, and I strongly deplore our failure to resume our aid program to Israel. I wonder how many of my colleagues are aware that the 1956 program of surplus foods for Israel amounting to about forty to fifty million dollars is in a state suspension. In addition, the \$25 million grant-in-aid to Israel voted by the Congress under the foreign-aid program has not gone forward, and the technical-assistance program to Israel, which has brought our top experts to help in developing Israel's agriculture, industry, transportation, health and education, public administration, and mass communications facilities, has been interrupted by the recall of most of these experts. Israel thus is faced with a major economic problem at a time when it is admitting over 80,000 homeless refugees. Given this increased flow of refugees, many of them victims of communism in Hungary and Poland, as well as the persecuted Jews from Egypt and north Africa, the withdrawal of American aid constitutes severe hardship. In addition, the arbitrary denial of passports to American citizens who wish to travel to Israel, particularly now that the holy season of Passover is approaching, constitutes a particularly unfriendly act on the part of this administration toward the only democratic country in the Middle East. I call upon the President to restore this urgently needed aid and to treat Israel once again as she is entitled to be treated as a valuable ally in our battle against Communist aggression.

President Eisenhower told the Nation that the United Nations ought to support peace in the Middle East. He has thrown the full responsibility for keeping the peace in the Middle East to the

United Nations. Here is where the trouble lies. Without lessening our support of the U. N., we must recognize the existing hard fact.

There is a voting bloc in the United Nations which has developed within the year which could spell death for the little nation of Israel in the years ahead. We should consider it.

Because of the Soviet veto in the Security Council, the real power of the United Nations has shifted to the General Assembly, where all the nations may vote. But in the assembly, a resolution can be adopted only by a two-thirds vote.

This gives the Afro-Asian-Soviet group of 36 nations the power to defeat any resolution of which it disapproves.

This applies today to the Israel debate because it means that while sanctions against Israel could be adopted, no General Assembly resolution could be passed against Egypt if she resumed the blockade against Israel shipping and the raids against Israel settlements. It means that the United Nations can no longer strike a just balance on the Arab-Israel issue.

It behooves us, therefore, to evolve our own foreign policy in the area, a policy that is firmly based upon our own interests, that is willing to take risks in pursuance of our objectives, not a set of platitudes. Such a policy would have as its paramount aim, the welfare of the United States and its allies in the free world, and would prove ourselves to be a nation interested in true justice, not just in temporary gain because of oil considerations or other special interests.

There has been much talk of a "void" in the Middle East, with respect to responsible leadership. If we are truly interested in filling that void, in the interests of permanent peace, even now it is not too late to do some or all of the following:

First. Secure from Egypt a valid and legal binding agreement to give to the United Nations the responsibility of maintaining free passage through the Straits of Tiran for all nonbelligerent shipping of all nations. Failing this, to reach agreement with appropriate nations mutually binding themselves to guarantee this freedom of passage.

Second. Failing a voluntary agreement by Egypt that United Nations forces should be permanently established in control of military and civilian functions in the Gaza Strip, we should lead a fight for a declaration by the Assembly of the United Nations that because of the violations of previous armistice agreements, it has become the responsibility of the United Nations to assume such powers.

Third. To secure from the United Nations Assembly a statement that any further assaults upon Israel territory or citizens from the Sinai Desert will justify the closing of the border and the manning of the border by United States security forces.

Fourth. A statement that the United States will consider a failure by Egypt to help organize and adhere to the internationally controlled Suez Canal administration will be considered by the United States as an indication of bad faith, and result in immediate steps by the United States in establishing other means of

transportation to the Mediterranean, including passage through Israel from the Gulf of Aqaba.

Fifth. An all-out effort in the United Nations to secure and to set up enforcement machinery for an embargo of all military arms shipments to any country of the Middle East until permanent peaceful conditions and treaties have been reached between Israel and the Arab States.

Only such an approach would justify the terms we are demanding of Israel. Admittedly, it is not an easy one, but it can contribute immeasurably to the pacification and progress of the Near East, and would not injure our Western ideas of liberty and freedom. It certainly is far less dangerous than the present ill-fated policy of toying with sanctions of doubtful morality and high-explosive potential. Mr. Speaker, it is high time that the United States, under the leadership of its President, rise to the great challenge of our time. The privilege of leading the world forces of freedom will, I pray, be met by a program bold enough, far sighted enough, and humane enough to insure the coming of lasting peace with justice.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I wish to commend the gentleman from California upon these forthright statements and say that I agree with him.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thank the gentleman very much indeed.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ADDONIZIO] may extend his remarks immediately following those of the distinguished gentleman from California; and, on my own behalf, I ask unanimous consent that my remarks may also be extended at this point in the RECORD and to include two documents which I am about to refer to, together with tabulations and exhibits connected thereto.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad that the gentleman from California has seen fit to take this time. I know the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BOYLE] will follow him shortly with another special order on the same subject. I wish to commend them and all of the other Members of the House who participate in these special orders for giving their time and attention to this very important matter.

May I direct the attention of the House to certain facts to supplement or corroborate what is being said. Corroboration of the distinguished gentleman's statements is unnecessary. Nevertheless some people may say, you made some statements, you made some charges. Is there any evidence to back them up?

Mr. Speaker, there is ample evidence to substantiate every statement of fact

that has been made on the subject by the distinguished gentleman from California. One document I hold in my hand is entitled "Nasser's Pattern of Aggression." Its contents will be included in my remarks in accordance with leave already granted to me. This contains the translations into English of various documents. The Arabic appears here, too, but in accordance with the rules of the House the Arabic will not appear in the RECORD. The translations into English will. These are photostats of original documents captured from the Egyptian Army, taken from prisoners captured by the Israel Army.

They contain, among other things, original orders issued to these men, not only issued to the officers and members of the Egyptian armed forces but to the guerrillas, to the fedayeen, the trained guerrillas, who are actually part and parcel of the Egyptian Army. We find set forth here their orders to go into Israel and commit all kinds of murder and ravage, robbery and destruction. You have the details here, the dates of the orders, the precise directions to these people. Throughout these documents you will find repeated the statement that Egypt and Egyptians cannot rest and will not rest until every Israeli has been annihilated.

I have in my hand another document which in accordance with leave granted to me will also be spread on the RECORD as part of my remarks. It deals with another important phase of this matter, though actually independent of the war or belligerency between Egypt and Israel or between the Arabs and Israel. It is entitled "The Black Record. Nasser's Persecution of Egyptian Jewry."

Here you have documented Nasser's persecution of Jews of all nationalities, not only British Jews, French Jews, Jews who came there from all parts of Europe, but the native born Egyptians, men, women, and children who trace their ancestry back to Jews who were born in Egypt, long before Nasser's ancestors. These people have been deprived of their Egyptian nationality solely because they are Jews. The British Jews, the French Jews, other European Jews who had sought refuge in Egypt during the Hitler days, are all deprived of their rights. Many of them had been naturalized as Egyptian citizens.

By one fell swoop of the hand, Mr. Nasser, after, I repeat, after the fighting ceased, after the United Nations said, this fighting between Israel and Egypt, and between Britain and France and Egypt, must stop, and after they had stopped the fighting, Nasser issued these decrees depriving these people of all of their rights and drove them all out of Egypt. Many of them were given orders to leave on an hour's notice. As these people, with written orders of expulsion, arrived at the point of departure, they were searched, the orders were taken from them, and they were required to sign a document indicating that they were leaving Egypt voluntarily, and abandoning all of their property and money to the Egyptian Government. They were permitted to leave with a few Egyptian pounds, in most instances as

little as 10 pounds. That is all they were able to take out.

What is even worse than that, one hostage was taken from each family; one person out of every family was seized by the Egyptian authorities without warrant or process, thrown into jail without indictment or trial, and held as a hostage so that the rest of the families as they got beyond the borders of Egypt would not tell of the terrorism that was being practiced upon them under this dictator Nasser.

All of these things, all of these black record documents, long since have been placed on the desks of President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Dulles, and all that has happened has been a dreadful—a deafening silence. There were any number of requests made to the President and to the Secretary to do something in the United Nations about this horrible situation. Once in December a United States delegate to the United Nations rose on the floor of the general assembly and referred to this and said it would be best that we do not talk any more about it and asked all those delegates who listed their names to speak on the subject not to speak any further on the subject, lest the talk worsen the situation.

Shades of Hitler.

I think it is high time that the President directed his delegation to the United Nations to stand up and protest against these inhumane and bestial acts and that something should be done about it. If we meant what we said when we became a party to the convention on human rights of the United Nations, it is high time something was done about this.

Again I commend the gentlemen who are participating in these special orders and I join them in urging that there can be no peace without justice in that part of the world or anywhere else.

I am sure that if the program that the gentleman from California has so succinctly set forth is implemented, we can have peace in that part of the world—peace with honor—peace with dignity—peace with justice.

The two items I referred to during my remarks are as follows:

#### NASSER'S PATTERN OF AGGRESSION—CAPTURED DOCUMENTS REVEAL ARMY AND FEDAYEEN ROLES IN EGYPTIAN PLOT AGAINST PEACE

On October 29, 1956, the Army of Israel crossed into the Sinai Desert in order to wipe out the bases from which fedayeen terrorist gangs were sent by the Egyptian high command into Israel, and break up the concentration of military forces, which had been built up during the previous year for an attack upon Israel.

In the course of the rapid Israel advance the Egyptian forces were broken up, over 5,000 prisoners were taken and heavy booty was captured. The remnants of the defeated Egyptian Army fled in disorder to the west bank of the Suez Canal. So rapidly did they abandon their positions that the Egyptian headquarters units failed to destroy their archives, which fell into the hands of the advancing Israel forces.

The documents seized in these archives, some of which are reproduced below, bear significant testimony to the preparations made by the Egyptian military junta for war against Israel. They reveal that the oft-stated Egyptian plan of invading Israel and

annihilating her was not mere bluff. They show clearly that the concentration of Egyptian forces in the north of the Sinai Desert was of a definitely offensive character, designed for an all-out war against Israel.

Thus, a directive of the command of the 3d Infantry Division of the Egyptian Army states that: "Every commander must prepare himself and his soldiers for the important battle with Israel in which we are fully immersed, with the aim of realizing our lofty tradition, i. e., to overpower and destroy Israel in the shortest possible time, and with the greatest brutality and bestiality in battle."

The documents reveal that the troops stationed in the Sinai Desert in an offensive posture against Israel included the 3d and 8th Infantry Divisions, the 1st Armored Brigade and three infantry battalions, with strong armor, air cover, airships, and vast supplies built up during the past year. Troops were being trained for the impending invasion.

Other documents throw a revealing light on the fedayeen squads recruited by the Egyptian High Command from criminal elements in the Gaza area for the purpose of murder, robbery, and sabotage in Israel.

Finally, there are the drawings found in a school where the children were asked to exercise their imagination on how best to kill Israelis; and the Arabic edition of Hitler's *Mein Kampf*, standard reading for Egyptian officers, from which they are taught to draw their inspiration for the war of extermination against Israel.

#### THE EGYPTIAN ARMY

Nasser: "The war between us and Zionism has not yet ended, and perhaps has not yet even begun. For us, this war of tomorrow or of the near future means the ending of a disgrace, the realization of a hope and the regaining of rights." (From Nasser's introduction to the book, *This Is Zionism*, Cairo, 1955.)

Gen. Abdul Akim Amer (Egyptian minister of war and commander in chief of the Egyptian Army): "Our army stands at the frontier ready to teach the Zionists a lesson they will never forget, when the time is ripe." (Broadcast by Government-controlled Cairo Radio, January 22, 1956.)

Anwar Al-Sadat (Egyptian minister of state): "Wait and see, Ben-Gurion. Soon will be proven to you the strength and will-power of the Arabs. Egypt and the Arab nations will teach you a lesson and quieten you forever. Egypt will grind you to the dust." (Reported in "Al Goumhouria," official government newspaper, April 8, 1956.)

The official directives of army commanders prove the avowedly aggressive character of the Egyptian forces in the Sinai Desert and the Gaza Strip. As stated by Maj. Gen. Ahmed Salam, commander of the 3d Infantry Division, in the document here reproduced and translated, the aim of the Egyptian army in the Sinai Desert and in the Gaza Strip was the destruction of Israel:

*Subject: Directive No. 2 of commander, 3d Infantry Division*

Third Infantry Division (Operations)

Registration No. 558/2/56/2/5/E.

Date: February 15, 1956.

From C. O. Egyptian District, Palestine.

To C. O. Reinforced 5th Infantry Brigade.

The following is the essence of the directives of the commander of the 3d Division to commanders and officers on the days and dates detailed below:

El Arish, day, February 1, 1956.

Rafah, day, February 3, 1956.

Khan Yunis, day, February 4, 1956.

Gaza, day, February 4, 1956.

Please see to the execution of these directives by all officers and insure that these directives shall not be put down in writing for classification lower than battalion or parallel classification in other units.



1. Introduction: Every commander must prepare himself and his soldiers for the important battle with Israel in which we are fully immersed, with the aim of realizing our lofty tradition, i. e. to overpower and destroy Israel in the shortest possible time and with the greatest brutality and bestiality in battle.

## 2. Training:

(a) Training is the basic factor in the attainment of our goal. Without it, it is impossible to achieve victory.

(b) Our faith in battle must be in all ranks, a faith in aggressiveness and speed.

(c) The following factors must be a part of the training:

(1) Perseverance and strong will to fight brutally.

(2) Training in leading men and their commanding officers gaining their confidence and affection. Any breach of discipline by soldiers against their officers must be prevented.

(3) Earnestness and realism in all our actions.

## 3. The commanders:

(a) The term "commander" is not limited to an officer but applies to anyone of any rank who has to give commands.

(b) Our policy must be built up on the preparation of commanders for the next 10 years. Aid to prepare commanders and their units:

(1) High discipline.

(2) Knowledge, and the increase of knowledge.

(3) Absolute obedience and loyalty to commander.

(4) Tact, initiative and care of equipment.

(5) Good example in leading men; treating men in order to gain their confidence and affection.

## (c) Personality of commander:

(1) The commander should control his men more by personal example than by punishment.

(2) He must accept every decision of his superior officer without hesitation.

(3) When the commander imposes his personality on his unit, hesitations about entering battle are dispelled, regardless of reasons such as lack of time or equipment. His personality is thus decisive in determining the victorious outcome of the battle.

(d) Hence the annual report of officers in general and commanders in particular must include:

(1) The level of ability of the commander.

(2) His ability to lead his men.

(3) His ability to take care of his equipment.

(e) The mistakes made by the commander when he takes fateful decisions, or when he executes an order given to him are not to be condemned, because they teach a lesson that must be put to use. Mistakes emanating from carelessness, however, including those from unfitting behavior, should be treated with all severity.

(f) Clarity in giving orders, the exposure of errors, the expression of opinions and criticism, are the right and duty of every commander. Forthrightness must be a constructive, and not a destructive factor. It must not be an instrument of degradation. Implied by this is also appreciation of diligence and fitting and constructive guidance of the one who errs.

(g) Commanders of all ranks must understand that their place is not in offices but rather with their soldiers, either training, directing or educating them, studying their social problems and participating with them in sport and entertainment.

4. Arms and equipment: Commanders of all ranks must make certain that—

(a) Every weapon shall be fit for action and efficient use by periodic tests with live ammunition.

(b) That vehicles are fit for service. Drivers must be instructed in their proper

maintenance. They must be given instructions against over-speeding.

5. Fortifications: Trenches should be examined to insure that they are as deep as a man's requirements. Arms must be examined of course in the light of ability to use them from this position, and with the view of testing the soldiers' expertness in aiming and fire.

6. Inspection: It is expected that a number of commanders of units of the Central District will conduct a tour of inspection in the area of the unit. We must therefore be worthy of appreciation and be able to explain the situation, whether by means of maps or on the ground, each according to his level. Likewise, it is possible that a number of officers and other ranks of the unit will conduct tours of inspection of the battle order of the units of the Central District, within a period of 7 hours, beginning and ending in Abu Ageilah.

7. Hit and run policy: Hit and run policy is transformed into aggressive policy as follows—

(a) Fifth Brigade—in constant preparedness.

(b) Third Brigade should arrive by April 1, 1956, for company assault training within the framework of the battalion.

(c) Eighty-sixth Brigade must arrive April 1, 1956, for company assault training, regardless of present shortage of manpower and equipment.

(d) The National Guard must complete the training of its volunteers in invasion tactics, without regard to training received preceding their entry into camp. The training of every course must end within 7 weeks from arrival at the camp.

8. Our aim is always "the destruction of Israel." Remember, and act for its attainment.

LIWA (major general) AHMED SALEM,

Staff Officer.

## OFFENSIVE POSITION

Even administrative units were being trained for the impending attack on Israel, as borne out by the following Training Instructions of the 3d Division. The basic purpose was transition to an offensive position.

3d Infantry Division, training instructions for the administrative units for the year 1956-57

## Purpose

1. Training the men of the administrative units of the division during the period between June 1, 1956, and March 31, 1957, and bringing them to the highest possible level.

## Responsibility

2. Every commander is responsible for the training of his units down to the lowest rank as well as for their attaining a high level of training in a friendly atmosphere and through cooperation with the remaining units of the division. All this is in addition to the operational task that has been set for him.

## General Framework for Training

3. The basic purpose of training this year is the transition from a defensive to an offensive position. The administrative units must work together with the other units and must prepare their men for these operations.

4. All of them must concentrate on training the units in night operations and in maneuverability.

5. All the administrative units must undertake to prepare the soldier so as to make him fit for battle. The soldier should also be prepared for the professional task that has been assigned to him.

(The last part of the document deals with the technical details concerning the organization of the training.)

The document is signed by Bikhashi (Lt. Col.) Mahmoud Anis Ismail, 3d Infantry Division.

## EGYPTIAN RESPONSIBILITY FOR BORDER INCIDENTS

The following is a facsimile of an operational order issued by the eastern command of the Egyptian Army to the 2d and 3d Infantry Divisions on September 29, 1955. Egyptian responsibility for border incidents is demonstrated by this passage in the document (pars. 1 and 2):

"Our forces should harass the enemy and divert its attention by attacks on the settlements. These attacks should be based on the following principles: a number of settlements will be chosen as targets; the 2d Division will attack the settlements along the Eilat-Beersheba road; and the 3d Division will attack those near the Gaza-Rafa front."

The order then goes on to describe the size of the forces scheduled for these attacks, fixes the length and time of the operations (3 to 4 hours during the night), and asks for detailed plans to be submitted by October 15, 1955.

## AGAINST DEMARCATION OF ARMISTICE LINES

The Egyptian command also opposed the recommendation made by the United Nations Secretary General and the United Nations Chief of Staff to mark the armistice lines clearly in order to avoid border incidents. The document reproduced below is an order issued by the commander of the third Egyptian division stating that "the marking of the frontier lines including the area of El Auja and Khamsa is to be prevented by all means, including the use of force if necessary."

## ARMORED COLUMNS PREPARING IN SINAI DESERT FOR ASSAULT UPON ISRAEL

Reproduced below is a circular issued by the commander of the first armored division. This document compares the strength of the Egyptian and Israeli armored forces and ends with the following passage:

"In conclusion I shall not ask you gentlemen to decide whether Egypt or Israel is stronger; I shall leave it to the Israelis to find out for themselves the danger that is now threatening them from our armored forces, lurking in the Sinai desert to spring the trap on them."

(Signed) YUZHASHI,

Commander, First Armored Division.

## NAZI GERMANY IS THE MODEL

From training pamphlet No. 42, April 1955, issued by the training and education branch of the Egyptian Army:

"Germany convinced herself that the Jews are traitors and could not be trusted, and so she expelled them from her land, \* \* \* but outside of Palestine they could not find any refuge.

"In the years 1935-36, the Arabs stood up with arms against the Jews in order to drive them back into their countries of origin and clear them out of Palestine. The Palestine war united the Arabs in their aim to expel the Jews from the Holy Land and to return the refugees who were driven out by Israel. The Arab countries continue to proclaim their hatred of the Jews and are preparing to drive them out of the Holy Land.

"Thus history repeats itself. The Arabs refuse to leave even a single Jew in Palestine so that the country will be all Arab. Today it is we who are in the first line, preparing ourselves for the battle which will end in the annihilation of Israel."

## THE FEDAYEEN

Nasser: "I was no stranger to the fedayeen. I knew them in Faluja during the war in Palestine. When I decided to raise a unit of fedayeen I was reminded of the Faluja days and I knew at once that the sons of that land who have faith in their rights to it would be worthy to bear the name of fedayeen." (In a statement made to a correspondent of the Cairo daily Al Akhbar, and broadcast by Cairo Radio on May 29, 1956.)

Hassan el Bakouri (Egyptian Minister of Religious Properties): "There is no reason why the faithful fedayeen, hating their enemies, should not penetrate into Israel and transform the lives of its citizens into a hell. Yes, brother and sister Arabs. The fedayeen will be victorious because their motives are holy and their aims are the highest. They will be victorious because they are more diligent in death than Israel is in life." (Voice of the Arabs radio, April 11, 1956.)

Government-controlled Radio Cairo: "Egypt has decided to dispatch her heroes, the disciples of Pharaoh and the sons of Islam, and they will cleanse the land of Palestine. Therefore, ready yourselves; shed tears, cry out and weep, O Israel, because the day of your liquidation is near. This we have decided and this is our belief. \* \* \* There will be no peace on the border because we demand vengeance and vengeance is Israel's death." (August 31, 1955.)

The documents captured in the Sinai campaign clearly prove the objectives of the fedayeen murder gangs, organized by Nasser to take vengeance on Israel through a hit-and-run campaign of murder of civilians and sabotage of vital installations.

Infiltration and marauding had been going on ever since the 1949 armistice agreement, though on a smaller scale. In 1955, Nasser organized and trained the fedayeen as a paramilitary force, equipped and directed by the Egyptian Army.

Their function was to enter deep into Israel territory, ambush road traffic, kill men, women, and children, blow up wells and water installations, mine roads, collect military data, and at night demolish houses in which settlers and their families were peacefully asleep.

Israel's narrow size and long frontiers surrounded on three sides by Arab States made it an ideal target for these hit-and-run tactics. The country has virtually no hinterland. At its widest point, it is not more than 68 miles across. At its narrowest point, there are only 10 miles from the Mediterranean to Israel's eastern frontier. Few villages and towns are far from the border.

The accelerated fedayeen attacks followed Nasser's arms deal with the Soviet bloc. By November 1956 Israel, as a result of Egyptian action, had experienced 1,834 cases of armed robbery and theft, 1,339 cases of armed clashes with Egyptian armed forces, 439 cases of incursions from Egyptian-controlled territory, 172 cases of sabotage perpetrated by Egyptian military units and fedayeen in Israel. Over 450 Israel citizens were killed and over 1,000 wounded by fedayeen terrorists and other Arab attackers.

#### CHARACTER OF THE FEDAYEEN

The fedayeen were recruited for the most part from the destitute Arab population in the Gaza Strip which had been captured by the Egyptian Army when it invaded Palestine in 1948.

After recruitment, the fedayeen were first trained in Egypt and then employed on a monthly basis or paid for each mission. A large proportion of them were murderers and criminals released from prison on condition that they join the fedayeen units. Following is a document on this subject found by Israel troops in Gaza. The translation of the first paragraph reads as follows:

JULY 10, 1955.

To: Head of Operations Division.  
From: Headquarters, Military Forces in Sinai—Intelligence.

Subject: The Palestine National Guard.

Reference: Your letter of November 6, 1955.

1. These volunteers were recruited for service in the national guard, and not in the regular forces, by the Chief of Intelligence in Palestine, and most of them have a criminal past and they have but one desire: to wreak vengeance on Israel and to steal there. The action of the volunteers was taken in accordance with the proposal of the above-

mentioned chief of intelligence to the commanding general of the armed forces, who approved it on condition that the volunteers constitute a part of the Egyptian National Guard. The approval was given during a visit of the commanding general at the front.

The document is signed by:

LT. COL. AHMAD SALEM,  
Staff Officer, Commander of the  
Military Forces in Sinai.

#### EGYPTIAN ARMY INTERVENES ON BEHALF OF FEDAYEEN ON TRIAL FOR MURDER

How the Egyptians recruited murderers and other criminals for the fedayeen is further substantiated in a copy of an official letter sent to the administrative governor of Gaza by Egypt's chief of intelligence, commander of the fedayeen, in a successful intervention in behalf of Yunes Mubarak Hassan el-Abid, on trial for murder in Gaza.

The letter dated September 17, 1955, and signed by Maj. Mustafa Muhammad Hafez, said:

"The above-mentioned represents our office and is one of our most trusted men. He can always be depended upon to perform important and dangerous missions. During the period in which he worked for our office, he was a paragon of manhood and highest courage, always showing his love and readiness for sacrifice for Egypt and the Egyptian armed forces.

He has already proved this in the past by performing good deeds, especially quite recently.

The above mentioned has volunteered to work with the Palestinian national guard and has performed numerous infiltrations into Israel together with his comrades. He acted in causing explosions and sabotage and killings to avenge the incursion of the Jews into our position in Hamam on August 22, 1955.

These operations had important consequences for they instilled fear and anxiety into the Israel nation. They also raised the morale of Gaza residents and refugees, as well as members of the armed forces at that moment. These acts have raised high the name of Egypt among nations, and especially among the Arab peoples.

The lion's share of these wonderful acts belongs to the above-mentioned. He and the men of his squads have done good deeds, which it is worth while to mention and to praise. And there they are:

On August 29, 1955, they performed the following acts of revenge:

1. Killed three people working in an orange grove in Beit Hanan, 12901495.

2. Killed a mechanic in the power stations near al-Kubeiba.

3. Exploded a charge under the 70-meter main mast of the broadcasting station. Four subsidiary masts depend on this main mast in the Kubeiba area, 12721448.

4. Attacked the Jaliya settlement near al-Kubeiba, killing a man and wounding four others. Destroyed a building and damaged the store, or the dining room of the settlement.

5. Laid an ambush on the main road at al-Mughar. They saw a convoy of 22 various vehicles coming from the north. They opened submachinegun fire on a pickup which was last in the convoy. The vehicle had to stop and return fire, then continued its way to overtake the convoy. It is to be presumed that there were casualties among the occupants of the vehicle. The men of the ambush succeeded in escaping eastward and laid another ambush in the area of el-Jabaliya, between the village of Ajjur 14281219 and the village of Tel e-Safi.

On August 30, 1955, they performed the following operations:

1. Attacked a civilian pickup on its way from Tel e-San to the Ajjur settlement and killed its three occupants, destroying the vehicle.

2. Attacked the settlement of Sumell, destroying its guardhouse by throwing a hand grenade on it. Later they infiltrated into the settlement and blew up a house and all its inhabitants and later fled.

3. Lay in ambush along the road which links the village of al-Jasir to Falujja and attacked a pickup vehicle belonging to the Israel army and carrying soldiers. The vehicle was damaged and it is presumed that there were casualties among the passengers.

4. Ambushed three vehicles carrying soldiers on the Falujja-Abu Jaber road. It is presumed that there were casualties among the Jewish soldiers.

5. During their stay in this area they saw a convoy of 86 vehicles moving from north to south, and informed us accordingly.

Attached are several cuttings from the Egyptian press describing the acts of valor of the fedayeen.

As the above-mentioned is one of the accused in major crimes case No. 26/55, and taking into account his wonderful acts, we would ask you to have mercy on him and weigh his past full of acts of sacrifice. A way should be found to help him and not endanger his life. It may be mentioned as well that there will be an opportunity to use him in the future if he knows that the authorities took notice of his courageous actions in the past.

#### CAPTURED FEDAYEEN DESCRIBES TERROR GOAL

The character of the terrorism practiced is corroborated in the testimony of fedayeen captured in Israel.

Thus Abdullah Hassan Abu Sardani told the Jaffa military court, April 1956:

"I heard that the fedayeen receives a wage of 9 Egyptian pounds per mission, so I decided to enlist at the office of Major Hafiz. After training for 15 days at Mahal in the Gaza strip, I was sent to a camp in Egypt near the Pyramids. There, Egyptian officers taught us how to use British rifles, the Bren and Browning machineguns, the Karl Gustav automatic, and hand grenades. After that, I returned to a fedayeen base in the Gaza Strip. Major Hafiz sent two groups of us into Israel. One was instructed to reach Jaffa; the second, consisting of 10 men, was to attack the area Wadi Rubin, Yavne, Kubeiba, Gedera, Rishon-le-Zion. At the border, Major Hafiz shook hands with everyone and said: 'Good luck. You know your jobs—shoot up vehicles and kill everyone in sight.' We answered: 'Right, sir, that's what we are paid for.' We carried 400 bullets each and hand grenades. We were taken to the border by jeep and crossed the lines near the orchards at Beit Hanun."

#### EGYPTIAN EMBASSY IN JORDAN IS FEDAYEEN BASE

Having done their nefarious work in Israel, the fedayeen crossed over into Jordanian territory and handed over their arms and supplies to the Egyptian Embassy in Amman. These documents reveal the connivance between Egyptian and Jordanian authorities in the conduct of terrorist activities against Israel:

"Directorate of Military Intelligence, Intelligence Office—Palestine, No. 3597/24/1, Gaza 15.8 1956.

"Subject: Supplies and arms that the Palestinian fedayeen have transferred to the Egyptian Embassy in Amman.

"EXECUTIVE OFFICER: This is to notify you that the Palestinian fedayeen that arrived in Jordan and have accomplished acts of revenge in Israel during the period April 8-15, 1956, have returned their arms and supplies to the Egyptian Embassy in Amman. In Gaza a committee has been organized to register these supplies and arms. The lists have been passed to the Eastern Command.

"Enclosed find copy of said lists for your knowledge and use.

"SAGH (Major),

"Assistant Director, Field Military Intelligence, Mohammed Fathi Mahmoud,  
"(For Bikhashi (Lieutenant Colonel)).



"For your information—copy to commander of the liberation army.

"List of arms transferred to the Egyptian Embassy in Jordan in the period April 8-15, 1956, giving registration numbers of all weapons. Total: 59 units Karl-Gustav submachineguns (with the registration numbers of the weapons) 295 Karl-Gustav magazines and 1 rifle."

U. N. CHIEF OF STAFF SAYS SPONSORS OF FEDAYEEN ARE AGGRESSORS

On March 17, 1955, Gen. E. L. M. Burns, then chief of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization, reported to the Security Council: "Infiltration from Egyptian controlled territory has not been the only cause of present tension, but has undoubtedly been one of the main causes."

On April 8, 1956, General Burns, in a letter to Israel's Foreign Minister, declared, *inter alia*: "I am dispatching to the Foreign Minister of Egypt a protest against the action of the fedayeen, assuming it to have been authorized or tolerated by the Egyptian authorities, and requesting the immediate withdrawal of any persons under Egyptian control from the territory of Israel."

"I consider that if Egypt has ordered these fedayeen raids she has put herself in the position of an aggressor."

#### FEDAYEEN ARE PRAISED FOR THEIR ATTACKS

For efficiency in acts of murder and sabotage, the fedayeen were awarded certificates of merit:

*"General Command of the Armed Forces, Gaza Area Command, Aref Post."*

*"Certificate of Merit"*

"No. Rank: A volunteer sergeant.

"Name: Al Sayed Hasan Dahasmah.

"Unit: K. 313.

"I, Captain Tala'at Suleyman Jalabi, Commander of the Aref post, hereby declare that the above mentioned has fulfilled his holy mission on the land of Palestine on May 28, 1956, in a perfect way. He acted on the Israeli soil with exemplary courage, valor and bravery, and maintained excellent discipline, the highest morale and a noble behavior. He is a man who understands and appreciates discipline and reveres it.

"Thereby the present certificate is delivered to him.

*"(Signed) CAPT. TALA'AT SULEYMAN, Commander, Aref Post."*

*"General command of the armed forces, Gaza Strip command, Araf post"*

*"Certificate of Merit"*

"Name: Mohammed Al Sid Al-Hashash.

"Rank: Volunteer sergeant.

"Unit: National Guard.

"I, Uzabashi (Captain) Talaat Suleyman Jalabi, commander of the Araf post, give witness herewith that the above has fulfilled his holy duties in Palestine during the period 6 June 1956 to 6 September 1956 and fulfilled his tasks inside the area of Israel in the best way possible. He has served as a sublime example of bravery, heroism and willingness to sacrifice himself. In addition he set an example of the highest discipline and high morale and is able to assume responsibility to the full.

"This certificate is issued for the above reasons.

*"Uzbashi (captain), Commander Araf Post."*

*"Certificate issued on 6.9.56."*

#### SOME TYPICAL FEDAYEEN ACTIVITIES

These are some typical terrorist activities carried out by the fedayeen in Israel:

On March 24, 1955, Patish (a village in the Negev) was attacked while a wedding celebration was going on. One of the bridesmaids was killed, and 20 other guests were wounded.

On October 27, 1955, there were seven attacks by fedayeen in Israel territory adjacent to the Gaza Strip. A farmer was killed,

several others wounded in highway ambushes; two wells were blown up.

Two days later 4 workers were ambushed and killed; 2 soldiers were shot to death and 5 others wounded when their vehicles struck a mine near the settlement of Beerli.

In Gela village a well was blown up, at Nahla grenades were thrown into a farmer's house and a woman was severely injured. There were further ambushes and attacks on the following days, the entire toll being ten dead and many wounded.

Three weeks later fedayeen ambushed a bus traveling from Safad to Haifa, attacking it with machinegun fire and hand grenades, killing and wounding twelve of the passengers.

Between April 7 and 11, 1956, the wave of fedayeen murder and destruction reached its peak. During those five days there was a total of 64 attacks, in which 14 people were killed and 43 wounded. Among them six children and their teacher, who were murdered at the agricultural school of Shafrir while attending evening services.

In the summer of 1956, following the nationalization of the Suez Canal by the Egyptian Government, and the subsequent international conferences and discussions, there was a comparative lull in the activities of the fedayeen. However, as soon as Security Council discussions on the Suez Canal issue had come to an end, Egypt again felt free to turn against Israel and orders were given for a resumption of the fedayeen raids into Israeli territory:

In 1 week, 24 Israeli citizens were killed and wounded by the terrorist squads.

On October 14, 1956, the fedayeen organized a raid on Sde Boker, the Negev home of the Prime Minister of Israel, deep inside Israeli territory.

Commenting upon this raid, Cairo Radio, on October 16, 1956, broadcast the text of an official communique issued by fedayeen headquarters in Gaza: "The fedayeen headquarters in Gaza has issued a communique stating that a group of fedayeen succeeded on October 13 to cross the southern border of Palestine in order to discover the concentration points and the factories which the Zionists have started to transfer to the coastal region so as to get them out of the fire range of Egyptian guns which threaten to destroy them. The communique of fedayeen headquarters in Gaza states also that all the fedayeen returned safely to their bases, except two who are believed to have been killed in an encounter which took place between them and the guards of Prime Minister Ben-Gurion's home in Sde Boker. Further, it is believed that two other fedayeen have been wounded and taken to a hospital in Rehovoth. The fifth of the fedayeen has not yet returned from his mission in occupied Palestine."

On October 15, 1956, an ambulance was ambushed north of Safiah.

On October 20, 2 army vehicles were blown up by mines placed on the Ketziot road, and 3 soldiers were killed and 27 wounded.

#### FEDAYEEN REORGANIZED AFTER SINAI CAMPAIGN

After the Sinai campaign Nasser reorganized his fedayeen operations so that on December 2, 1956, the Government-controlled Cairo Radio could announce, "a heavy campaign inside Israel in the coming winter."

And on December 24, 1956, Cairo Radio stated that "if Israel prevented the use of Gaza bases there are many other places which could be used for that purpose." "The Government of Egypt is organizing fedayeen and instilling them with readiness to fight." Other Arab governments, the broadcast said, "are training fedayeen and instructing them in warfare which is neither forbidden nor shameful."

During the month of December 1956, over 30 raids were organized inside Israel from bases in Jordan and Lebanon.

#### TEACHING HATRED

Nasser: "I am not fighting solely against Israel but also against world Zionism and Jewish capital. My task is to deliver the Arab world from destruction through Zionist intrigue which has its roots in the United States and which receives aid from Britain and France. \* \* \* The hatred of the Arabs against the Zionists is very strong, and there is no sense in talking about peace with Israel. There is not even the smallest place for negotiations between the Arabs and Israel." (Interview with New York Post correspondent, October 14, 1955.)

Radio Cairo: "Peace between us and the Jews is impossible. As far as we are concerned, it is a matter of life and death, not a dispute over frontiers or interests. Nor is it a difference over viewpoints which require mediation for settlement. The Middle East cannot hold both of us. It is either we or them. \* \* \* There is no other solution. \* \* \* Steel and bullets will realize our objectives." (In a broadcast on January 12, 1956.)

The campaign of hate against Israel does not stop short of the schools. It is part of classroom instruction in Egypt. Reproduced below are drawings submitted by high-school students, in El Arish, chief town of the Sinai Desert, in an examination under the general heading of "Ambushing Israelis."

#### MEIN KAMPF

An Arabic translation of Hitler's *Mein Kampf* was part of the standard issue to Egyptian officers. This is the cover and frontispiece of copies found on Egyptian prisoners-of-war.

#### THE BLACK RECORD—NASSER'S PERSECUTION OF EGYPTIAN JEWRY

##### INTRODUCTION

On October 29, 1956, units of the Israeli Army entered the Sinai Peninsula. On November 1, within 72 hours of this thrust, the Egyptian Government promulgated a series of detailed, highly complex decrees which, among other things, established a state of siege, imposed a thorough-going censorship, facilitated the denationalization of certain Egyptian citizens, and provided a juridical basis for the subsequent sequestration and confiscation of property of various private persons.

On the very next day, November 2, the General Assembly of the United Nations adopted a resolution calling for a cease-fire and the withdrawal of Israeli, British and French forces from Egypt. On the following day, the United Nations adopted a resolution calling for the creation of a U. N. emergency force to enforce the truce. On November 4, the Egyptian Government published further military decrees implementing its earlier regulations for the seizure of private property. On November 6, the United Nations cease-fire was accepted by the belligerent parties and arrangements were made for supervision of the cease-fire by an international U. N. police force.

It was expected that the repressive measures enacted during the hostilities would be withdrawn or annulled after the cease-fire. But this expectation proved futile. Beginning with reports received from Cairo on November 15, and almost daily thereafter, it became evident that Egypt was bent on exploiting the brief hostilities to despoil and ultimately destroy its Jewish community. Indeed, after the termination of hostilities, the persecutions of Egyptian Jewry, far from diminishing, took on such intensity that their ultimate import could not be mistaken. The initial reports from Cairo came to the world's notice in confused and fragmentary form. This was due to the special care taken by the Nasser regime to obscure the truth and veil its arbitrary actions in secrecy. Patterned on Nazi techniques, the Egyptian campaign against the Jews has been con-

ducted with ruthless efficiency and disregard of the minimal moral standards that civilized nations embrace.

There are, however, important differences between Hitler's and Nasser's approach. The latter has learned to avoid the errors committed by Hitler. Where Hitler's anti-Semitism was blatantly avowed, Nasser's anti-Semitism is concealed. Where Hitler openly attacked Jews as Jews, Nasser has resorted to the disingenuous pretense that his animus is limited to "Zionists." In short, the Egyptian Government has learned from Hitler's example that it cannot afford to ignore world opinion and that it is more expedient to conduct its anti-Jewish campaign in a manner that would avoid international notoriety. In the words of Dean James A. Pike of the Cathedral of St. John the Divine in New York, "Nasser is much more clever than the Nazis."

The precautions of secrecy taken by the Nasser regime and its deliberate obfuscations made it difficult in the initial stages of the anti-Jewish campaign to piece together an exact picture of what was taking place in Egypt. The early reports could only hint at the systematic and well-organized plan, long in preparation, that had been put into practice to pauperize, denationalize and expel the Jewish community. Since then, thousands of Egyptian Jews have arrived in Europe and Israel and have corroborated by their own experiences the harrowing reports of journalists, travelers, and diplomats about the desperate plight of the Jewish community of Egypt. Official Egyptian documents also have come to light which testify to the drastic measures adopted by Egypt to destroy the Jewish community.

The physical survival of one of the oldest and most peaceful religious communities of the world is at stake. Its rescue depends upon firm intervention with the Nasser regime by our own country as well as by the other free nations.

#### I. EGYPTIAN XENOPHOBIA

##### *The semantic ruse*

Spokesmen for the Egyptian Government have repeatedly denied that it is engaged in a campaign of anti-Jewish repression; they contend that whatever action has been taken against Jews has been directed solely against "Zionist agents." But the fact is that the Zionist movement has had little influence among Egyptian Jews. This is not surprising if only because Egypt's 50,000 Jews, a tiny minority in Egypt's total population of 22,000,000, would not have been so foolhardy, even if they so desired, to espouse pro-Zionist or pro-Israel attitudes since 1948, let alone engage in any acts even remotely inimical to the security of the Egyptian Government.

But as Fred Sparks, a Scripps-Howard correspondent, has observed, the Egyptian authorities emphasize the anti-Zionist rather than the anti-Jewish aspects of their discrimination strictly for public relations purposes:

"At this time there is 'no anti-Jewish terror' in the manner of a Hitler-style pogrom. The pressure—subtle and unofficial—is a 'shadowy persecution.' . . . The Government has condemned anti-Jewish threats and violence; such publicity cannot serve Colonel Nasser in his battle for world opinion." (New York World Telegram, December 27, 1956.)

But in 1947, Egyptian leaders were less discreet. Dr. Mohammed Hussein Heykal Pasha, then chief of the Egyptian delegation to the United Nations, publicly warned that:

"The lives of 1,000,000 Jews in Moslem countries would be jeopardized by partition . . . if Arab blood is shed in Palestine, Jewish blood will necessarily be shed elsewhere in the world despite all the sincere efforts of the Government concerned to pre-

vent such reprisals." (New York Times, November 25, 1947.)

These threats are now realities. Despite avowals by Egypt's officials that there is hostility only to Zionists and not to other Jews, open anti-Semitic comments have appeared in the Egyptian press and have been made by Colonel Nasser himself. On August 14, 1955, he publicly stated:

"I am not fighting solely against world Zionism and Jewish capital." (Al Ahram, Cairo, August 15, 1955.)

Following the same line, the Cairo newspaper, El Tahrir, on November 27, 1956—that is, after the wartime censorship had already been instituted and no newspaper article could appear without the sanction of the Egyptian Ministry of the Interior—published an article describing the history, traditions, and religious practices of the Jews, in terms as odious as any that can be found in the Nazi and Fascist publications of the 1930's and 1940's.

If there was any lingering doubt that the semantic maneuver of adopting the term "Zionist" for "Jew" was designed solely to divert world opinion from the essential character of Egypt's anti-Jewish campaign, it is finally dispelled by the scope of that campaign. The number of Jews affected by the acts of internment, expulsion, and sequestration is so large as to preclude any belief that the target of Egypt's wrath is solely the "Zionists" who allegedly menace Egypt's security.

##### *The doctrine of "Egyptianization"*

In the earlier phases of the Egyptian anti-Jewish outbreaks, there was a tendency to believe that they represented merely a temporary and passing expression of ultra-nationalist fervor intensified by Israel's entry into Sinai. But the scope of the continuing anti-Jewish campaign, and the speed with which it has reached into every corner of Egyptian Jewish life, indicate that it is the culmination of a carefully prepared and planned design for the dispersion and destruction of the Jewish community.

One of the proudly proclaimed doctrines of the Nasser revolution is that of "Egyptianization." This professedly is intended only to encourage domestic ownership of domestic industry, but actually it is a euphemism for a program that includes the expropriation of private property, the exclusion from economic life, and the expulsion from Egypt not only of so-called "enemy aliens" and "foreigners" but also of non-Moslem native Egyptians, no matter how long they and their families have resided within the land. It should be borne in mind that a large majority of the 50,000 Jews living in Egypt were born there and derive from families who have lived there for generations, but that less than 20 percent have been permitted to obtain Egyptian citizenship. About 15,000 were deemed stateless and the rest were technically the nationals of foreign countries, principally Great Britain, France, Italy and Greece, even though most of them had never been outside of Egypt's borders.

The Egyptian authorities, by restrictive interpretation of the Nationality Act of September 13, 1950, as well as earlier statutes, for years have in effect barred all Jews from citizenship in the interest of preserving national homogeneity. Since 1936, an occasional Jew has been permitted naturalization, but throughout this period such cases were exceptional. It is ironic that many technically stateless Jews, as well as those nominally nationals of other countries, belong to families whose residence in Egypt antedates that of some members of the military junta now in control of the government.

Nevertheless, these are the persons now being made the principal victims of Egyptianization. The way this program operates

to exclude them from virtually all segments of Egyptian economic life is demonstrated by the effect of a decree announced in Cairo on January 15, 1957. To quote the New York Times of January 16:

"Nasser has decreed the 'Egyptianization' of all British and French banks and insurance companies in Egypt. . . . All other foreign banks and insurance companies were given 5 years before they too would be 'Egyptianized'. . . . Private shareholders will continue to retain their stocks in companies, but all shareholders must have been born in Egypt and must be Egyptian citizens. Directors must be native-born citizens also. . . . Another decree to become effective tomorrow makes it imperative that all agents representing foreign manufacturers in Egypt must be native-born Egyptian citizens. However, the Government can in certain cases extend permission to foreigners to continue as agents of those companies for five years more."

Since a large proportion of the Jewish community has been barred from Egyptian citizenship, this decree disqualifies practically all Jews from participating in any Egyptian financial corporation. The "Egyptianization" program under Nasser is reminiscent of the Nazi slogan "Germany for the Germans" and the Nazi technique for pauperizing the Jews and forcing them out of the country.

That the destruction of the Jewish community is a deliberate and long-planned policy of the Nasser administration is made evident by the dispatch with which it promulgated its new nationality laws and the regulations governing the sequestration of private property. These decrees are intricate and comprehensive. They are obviously the product of considerable study and preparation. They could not have been conceived, written and printed in the three or four days that intervened between the opening of military hostilities between Israel and Egypt and their publication in official journals. The very perfection of the techniques now employed by the Egyptian government clearly indicates that these acts reflect not an improvised response in a moment of crisis but a thorough and well-wrought plan for the spoliation and destruction of the ancient Jewish community of Egypt.

In carrying out this design the Nasser government has resorted to four principal measures: (1) seizure of hostages; (2) denationalization of Jews; (3) internments and expulsions; and (4) sequestration of property.

#### II. TECHNIQUES OF DESTRUCTION

##### *The seizure of hostages*

The most reprehensible of all the acts of persecution ordered by Nasser—the seizure of hostages—is motivated by two considerations: to terrorize the Jewish community and to intimidate Jews expelled from the country from speaking the truth about what is taking place in Egypt. In seizing hostages, it has reverted to a method of suppression that all civilized states have abjured. In seeking to ensure the silence of the Jews who have departed from Egypt, the Nasser regime has emulated typical totalitarian practices.

An Associated Press dispatch from Port Said on November 26, 1956, reported that "Jews began leaving Port Said today, leaving behind hostages seized from each family by the Egyptians the night before the British and French landings." The seizure of hostages was confirmed the next day by Mr. Harry Coe, the British consul in Port Said. Mr. Coe declared that he had received reports that of the 300 Jewish residents of Port Said one member of each family was taken away by the Egyptian police and none has been heard from since. He added that the secret police reportedly seized a number of Jewish leaders in raids in other Egyptian



cities. (New York World Telegram, November 29, 1956.)

This practice of seizing hostages extended beyond the immediate emergency of the British and French landings. On December 15, the Washington Star reported:

"The last shipload of Jews fled Port Said yesterday, leaving behind two frightened families. These two refused to depart until their men are released from hostage.

"They say it's no use going anywhere without their men," explained Rabbi Marcel Kalifa, Jewish chaplain for the French forces who supervised yesterday's departure. "They feel life isn't worth while with just half their families and they would just as well suffer here as somewhere else."

He added: "Please, no names, they're in trouble enough already."

"Jewish families had been visited by Egyptian secret police in the early morning hours just before British and French troops landed here last month and one member of each family was taken hostage. There has been no word of them since, Jews here say. Rabbi Kalifa said his check of families here showed 92 had been taken from Port Said's total Jewish population of 300 in that raid."

On December 12, a New York Post correspondent reported that he had personally talked to a dozen persons whose friends and relations had disappeared, and that in a synagogue he visited "every Jew I talked to had a close friend or relative who had just 'disappeared.'"

#### *The denationalization process*

A product of the combined thinking of Egypt's Jewish department and the authors of the Egyptianization program was Law No. 329, issued on November 20, 1956 by President Nasser. This law, in effect, denationalized all Zionists and laid the groundwork for branding as undesirable all stateless Jews in Egypt because of their alleged failure to integrate themselves into Egyptian life and because of their presumably unstable loyalty to the state. The text of the law was published in Egypt's Journal du Commerce et de la Marine and reproduced in the Egyptian newspaper, *Le Progrès Egyptien*.

The most drastic feature of this law is contained in Article 1, which stipulates that "neither Zionists, nor those against whom a judgment has been handed down for crimes of disloyalty to the country or for treason" are to be considered Egyptian nationals, and that "no request for the delivery of a certificate of Egyptian nationality will be accepted from persons known as Zionists." The law provides that the citizenship of all Jews who acquired Egyptian nationality after January 1, 1900, is to be reexamined for possible denationalization proceedings and only those who can persuade the minister of interior that they are not lacking in loyalty and that they are not Zionists are secure against cancellation of nationality.

It has already been noted that the Egyptian authorities tend to use the terms Zionist and Jew interchangeably. When this is taken into account, along with what is known of the avowed anti-Jewish views of Zakariah Mohieddine, who functions in Egypt as chief censor as well as minister of the interior, it is evident that the Jews who apply to him for preserving their nationality will receive scant sympathy. Whatever their personal beliefs and sympathies, Egyptian Jewish nationals who acquired citizenship after 1900 have only the remotest chance of maintaining their nationality.

The chief effect of the new nationality law will be to augment the ranks of stateless Egyptian Jews, and this is an ominous time in Egypt to be rendered stateless. The promulgation of this law heralds the summary deportation of 15,000 stateless Jews.

One of the more cynical aspects of Egypt's anti-Jewish campaign is its use of legal forms to disguise its lawless behavior. The

Egyptian Government has effected the mass eviction of Jews on the pretext of their anomalous legal status. It has expelled or forced the departure of thousands of persons whose sole fault is that they could not persuade the Egyptian Government that Jewish affiliation should be no bar to citizenship. The average stateless Jew in Egypt is neither a recent arrival nor a person indifferent to citizenship. Typically, he belongs to a family that has resided in the country for generations and has made energetic efforts to acquire nationality. In other modern States he would be considered eminently qualified for the responsibilities and opportunities of citizenship. In selecting stateless Jews as the chief victims of xenophobic nationalism, the Egyptian Government was careful to single out the most vulnerable group in the country. The stateless persons can make no claim to the protection of any government and there exists no official agency empowered to intervene in their behalf.

The mass expulsion of the Jewish community began with the sudden and shocking notification to thousands of stateless persons that they were to be expelled, in most cases within a matter of 7 to 10 days. The alternative to evacuation was internment. There was no publication of an edict, or decree, or general order of expulsion. In most cases, police descended on the stateless Jews and ordered them to leave or face imprisonment. In a few cases, however, Egyptian police did issue to individuals written orders of expulsion in the expectation that these documents would be extracted from them at the time of departure. A few of these orders, however, were brought out of Egypt.

After originally concentrating its fire mainly on stateless Jews, the Egyptian Government began to widen its target. It does not trouble now to make nice distinctions as to nationality. There are reports that on November 23, 1956, instructions were issued by Sheikh El Bakouri, the Egyptian Minister of Religious Affairs, and read on that day by order of the government in every mosque in every town and village in Egypt. El Bakouri announced that from that day on all Jews in Egypt were to be regarded and treated as enemies of the country. He urged the people of Egypt to refrain from contact, whether commercial or social, with Egyptian Jews, and assured them that the remaining Jews would soon be compelled to depart. He stated that the government was proceeding expeditiously to rid Egypt of the Jews; and on that ground alone asked Egyptians to refrain from private retaliations against them.

#### *Mass arrests*

Under cover of legalistic pretexts for persecution, the life of the Egyptian Jewish community has already been converted into a nightmare of oppression. Emergency Law No. 533 of 1954 authorized the Military Governor of Egypt to "order the arrest and apprehension of suspects and those who prejudice public order and security." The provisions of this law furnished the legal basis for the arrest and detention of thousands of persons, including many already under order of deportation but who were unable to obtain foreign passage. It is estimated that at least 1,000 persons were imprisoned under wretched physical conditions in the Prison des Barrages in Cairo, and in special detention centers in Cairo, Alexandria, Assouan, and Helopolis. Those jailed included practically every leader in Egyptian Jewish communal life. Almost every member of the Jewish Community Councils of both Cairo and Alexandria was arrested and imprisoned in the earliest stages of the terror. A few have since been released.

In seeking to screen its ruthless conduct from the world the Egyptian Government has not been entirely successful. It is impossible, despite the most carefully contrived schemes, to conceal official crimes of such

scope. In the first weeks of December a number of Egyptian Jewish escapees gave affidavits to the American Jewish Congress, attesting to the measures employed by the Egyptian Government to oppress its Jewish population and to harass them into voluntary flight. These persons are unwilling to disclose their names for publication but they are ready to appear before any official agency of the United States or the United Nations to describe the conditions they have personally witnessed in Egypt. The reason for their insistence on anonymity is understandable and, of itself, a significant commentary on Egypt's reign of terror.

There are uniform themes running through all the statements that have been received. The mass arrests of Egyptian Jews are accompanied by no legal warrant and there is no provision for arraignment or indictment. There is no discernible pattern or rationale in the sequence of arrests or in the manner in which individuals are singled out for imprisonment. No one is appraised of the identity of others arrested or of the grounds for arrest. Part of the nightmarish atmosphere derives from the mixture of informality and ruthlessness with which the arrests are carried out. The police appear suddenly at the residence of the person to be arrested, almost always late at night or in the early morning, obviously to avoid public attention. Occasionally the arresting officers are in civilian dress. There is no explanation for the arrest and very little conversation of any kind. Persons arrested are quietly ordered to pack a small case of personal articles and are then taken to the nearest police station. From that point they are assigned to detention centers. During the arrests there is no violence. The police have been careful to permit no show of brutality on the streets. But this restraint is dropped at the door of the detention centers.

As noted earlier, stateless Jews at first comprised the overwhelming majority of those arrested. But since then Jews of all nationalities have been interned. Possession of a passport of another country, even one at peace with Egypt, offers no protection to Egyptian Jews. At best, a foreign passport serves only to expedite final departure. The American Jewish Congress has in its files an affidavit from an American Jew interned in Egypt recently even though he had been traveling on a United States passport. This person, a native of Cairo, had entered the United States as a quota immigrant but had returned to Egypt to attend to personal business affairs. He was released from prison only after he had guaranteed he would leave Egypt.

While it is impossible to determine the exact number of arrests, it is certain that they have been carried out steadily since Israel's entry into Sinai. A dispatch appearing in the New York Times as early as November 24 reported that:

"Two days after the Israeli attack of October 29, the Egyptian police rounded up between 25 and 30 Jews and took them to Cairo. In effect, they are hostages there. 'What can I do? What can I do?' an elderly widow sobbed. Her older daughter, age 30, was among those taken to Cairo."

On the same day the Times correspondent in Cairo, Osgood Caruthers, noted that although "the Egyptians have made it a matter of basic doctrine that their strongest opposition was aimed at Zionism and at Israel, and not against the Jewish people," nevertheless the arrest orders "according to authoritative estimates affect thousands of Jews in Cairo who are of foreign nationality, many of them British and French subjects, or who are in the status of stateless persons. It was not known how many others might be affected throughout the rest of the country." He went on to observe:

"As it is, Britons, Frenchmen, and Jews of foreign nationality, or in the stateless

category, were being given individual orders as to when they were to pack up and leave the country. They were permitted to take with them 20 Egyptian pounds (\$56) for each adult and 10 Egyptian pounds for each minor."

On November 27, a New York Herald Tribune correspondent reported from Port Said: "Some 150 Jews, many of them old residents of this city, fled Egypt today on board a French hospital ship."

"Taking along not much more than they could carry, they sailed for Marseilles with 37 other evacuees from this occupied area. The group, which included 30 children, departed rather than face an uncertain fate when Anglo-French forces leave and the Egyptian Government takes over again."

"Before the trouble began, the community totaled an estimated 300 families. \* \* \* The number of Jews still here is believed to be less than 50."

"Most of the group were stateless, but a few carried Egyptian passports. They sailed with refugee permits that will allow them to stay in France for 3 months before deciding on a new domicile."

An International News Service correspondent reported that a Jewish escapee in Paris had told him:

"The policeman who arrested me was a fairly high official," he told me: "We've got a list of 6,000 Jews we're going to imprison or expel. And that's only a first list of 6,000. Soon there'll be no more Jews in Egypt. You'll all have to go." The refugees arrived in Europe begging correspondents not to use their names for fear of reprisals against relatives" (New York Journal-American, December 21, 1956).

Conditions in the improvised detention centers into which internees have been herded are appalling. The New York Post of January 8, 1957, gave this account:

"Jewish refugees arriving from Egypt disclosed today they were led handcuffed through the streets of Cairo and Alexandria and were stoned and spat upon by Arab mobs while their guards laughed and taunted: 'Now you are going to die.'"

"The men among the *Misir's* passengers had all been held at the Sebil School in Cairo, which the Egyptians had converted into an internment camp. The women were interned first at the Betesh School in Heliopolis, a suburb of Cairo, and later transferred to the Citadel prison. One of the women was interned with a 2-day-old baby."

"For the first 3 days of internment the men at Sebil were kept completely without food by the camp commandant, Major Hadidi, a blue-uniformed official of the national police."

"The stocky, muscular major seems to have conformed to the classic pattern of prisoner of war and concentration camp commandants. He was violently anti-Semitic, often proclaiming that Egypt had no place for Jews—although Colonel Nasser himself has said many times that Egypt welcomes 'loyal Jews,' a statement at which these refugees laugh with some ironic bitterness."

"For the first 3 days at Sebil, Major Hadidi locked 18 to 20 men in small rooms in which camp beds were packed so closely the occupants had to crawl over them to reach the door when they were finally allowed out. For the first 3 days they were kept without food."

"In all there were more than 500 men interned at Sebil. They were allowed to go to the toilet only twice a day and then only during 1 hour in morning and 1 hour in evening."

"After several weeks of internment the Egyptian government allowed a representative of the International Red Cross to visit the camp. The internees told him their serious grievances. On learning of their report Hadidi was so incensed that he locked all the men in their rooms for 3 days and gave them no food whatsoever. This meant

that for two 3-day periods in the 60 days they were held, the 500 went without any sustenance at all."

"And the food, when it was given, was comparable only to prisoner of warfare in the latter days of wartime Germany. Although orders were given for the men to be allowed 2 hours of daily exercise in the open, they were never allowed out of the buildings. On arrival their watches and all personal jewelry were taken by Hadidi's guards—and never returned."

"The women internees were equally bitter. The women were first taken to the school in Heliopolis, where their food was below subsistence level and sanitation facilities limited. They also were stripped of all jewelry and trinkets."

An International News Service dispatch in the New York Journal-American of January 7 reported:

"One man told of being taken to Cairo's Abassia Prison, where he was strung up by his wrists and beaten for 3 days. He said the torture was administered by Egypt's secret police in an effort to make him tell where his fortune was hidden."

"He added that another prisoner subjected to the same brutality went mad."

"One woman refugee, whose husband still is in prison, related: 'The terror began soon after the war began. Superintendents of all buildings began reporting the names of all Jews and other foreigners to police. Then came the police raids and orders confining us to our apartments. When the police would come after midnight, we knew it was bad. They would point at some member of our family and say, "Come along. You're wanted." Then they would take the member to the police station and imprison him without court procedure.'"

"She said the prisoners would be jailed along with criminals."

The arrival of the refugee ship *Misir* in Naples on January 7, 1957, afforded Western correspondents the first opportunity of interviewing a substantial group of Egyptian Jews free of Egyptian surveillance. The New York Times correspondent who reported their arrival was able to persuade some of the escapees to disclose their names:

"Aboard the *Misir* were Dr. Jacob Coen and Dr. Raymond Bayer, both formerly on the staff of the Jewish Hospital in Cairo. They had been held in the Jewish school in Cairo with hundreds of other men. The women and their families had been sent to a camp at Heliopolis."

"The physicians said there were 15 camp inmates to a room in the Cairo school. After reveille at 6 a. m., armed guards marched the inmates, 3 by 3, to a washroom. Then there were checks by policemen at 10 a. m. and 2, 4, and 10 p. m."

"Rabbi Shalom Morg said that most of his fellow passengers were destitute."

"Elie Matalon, 22 years old, former employee of a photographic agency in Cairo, said he had been deprived of Egyptian citizenship and interned after he had applied for a passport to go to Paris."

"Victor Benattar, a stateless chemist, who had been working for a foreign pharmaceutical concern in Cairo, charged that Egyptian police had beaten him till he signed a declaration that he was leaving the country for good."

"Ibrahim Vetaya, born in Egypt to Turkish parents, said he had been expelled with his wife and children after local authorities had seized his textile concern and ££800,000 in his bank account. [This would be equal to \$2,240,000.] None of the refugees had been allowed to take more than ££5 (about \$14) out of Egypt. They had many bundles but few suitcases."

"Most of the exiles asked that their names be withheld because they feared reprisals against relatives and friends."

"Of the 967 who arrived, 394 were women and 104 were children." (Times, January 7.)

There are widespread reports that upon learning of the arrest and imprisonment of Jewish leaders, the chief rabbi of Egypt, Haim Nahoum Effendi, acted to obtain their release. His appeal was summarily rejected, and he was instructed by government officials not to meddle in "political" affairs. Rabbi Nahoum, who has held office since 1922, had been repeatedly decorated by Egyptian governments for his public services. When his attempted intervention was so brusquely rebuffed, Rabbi Nahoum—old, sick, and almost blind—sent his resignation to President Nasser. Immediately thereafter two members of the security police came to his home and took him to the Ministry of the Interior where he was ordered to rescind his resignation; this he refused to do. One of his subordinates, however, was prevailed upon to issue an unauthorized "denial" of Rabbi Nahoum's resignation to an Associated Press correspondent. This "denial" is not given much credence among the Egyptian Jews who were his congregants and were familiar with the duress to which he was subjected. The New York Post reported on January 8:

"No one believes the Egyptian version of the recent broadcast by Egypt's Chief Rabbi Nahoum. They all claim Egyptian strong-arm men visited this aging, blind martyr and said: 'You must say you are a loyal Egyptian; otherwise you are a Zionist. Zionists are our mortal enemies and if you are a Zionist all Jews here will be named Zionists and imprisoned.'"

In the face of incontrovertible evidence of the mass arrests and abuse of Egyptian Jews, Egyptian officials have blandly denied all. However, like Egyptian Foreign Minister Mahmoud Fawzi, they have been compelled to admit that "a few Jews" were taken into custody "because they were dangerous to the security of the state." (New York Times, November 29, 1956.) Fawzi's "few Jews" became in the admissions of Lt. Col. Zakariah Mohleddine, Minister of the Interior, "288 Jews" who were being detained "for reasons of security." (Times, December 4, 1956.) In addition, Colonel Mohleddine, while denying blanket seizure of Jewish property, admitted that "the assets of rich Jews" had been placed under government control "to be sure that they do not try to smuggle their money out of the country." (New York Post, December 4, 1956.) Col. Abdel Kader Hatem, director of the Egyptian Information Office, stated that of the non-Egyptian Jews in Egypt "only 280 had been asked to leave for 'security reasons,' and 26 of these were now out of the country." (New York Journal-American, December 21, 1956.) But, at another point, Colonel Hatem had the effrontery to claim that "Egypt has not deported one single Jew." (New York Post, December 26, 1956.) How much faith can be reposed in official Egyptian denials of anti-Jewish measures can be gauged by the fact that Premier Habib Bourguiba, a Moslem himself and one who is certainly sympathetic to Arab aspirations, has found it necessary to protest to Egypt about the discrimination against Jews of Tunisian nationality. He reminded Egypt that his government had never "made any difference between Tunisians on the basis of their religion." (New York Times, December 26, 1956.)

#### Deportations

The most informed estimates indicate that between November 22, 1956, and January 23, 1957, 8,435 refugee Jews—almost one-fifth of the entire Jewish community—succeeded in making their way to various foreign ports. (A schedule of arrivals of refugee Jews from Egypt appears in the appendix.) Thousands more are anxiously seeking passage to avoid



imprisonment, and the shortage of transportation facilities has made the competition for space intense. William Richardson, in a report from Cairo published in the New York Post of December 13, 1956, contrasts the plight of the Nazi and Egyptian expellees in this regard:

"Thousands of British, French, and Jewish nationals \* \* \* have even less chance than the Hitlerian refugees in the 1930's of salvaging anything from their property. In those days it was possible to arrange for some transfer of property. Some British and French nationals were able to help in a few cases and there were many routes out of Germany. From the day sequestration and expulsion began here there has been only one route—via a daily Scandinavian Airlines plane. Other airlines are only now beginning services from Cairo airport."

In another dispatch published January 8, Mr. Richardson reports that those fortunate enough to get passage are permitted to take with them only one suitcase of clothing and 20 Egyptian pounds (\$56). They are forced to sign formal declarations promising never to return. They are required to sign away all ownership to property in Egypt and renounce all financial claim they might have. In return for the privilege of exit, they are forced to declare that all assets they leave behind are to be "given" to the Egyptian Government. There were a number of refugees who refused to leave Egypt but who were coerced into departure. Mr. Richardson continues:

"More than half the refugees to whom I talked said they had not asked permission to leave Egypt, as Nasser's government claims they did."

"On the contrary, many refused at first to sign a prepared typewritten statement saying they wished to leave. But they were forced at gunpoint to sign. At least a dozen were beaten when they refused to sign; one man so severely he was hospitalized for 10 days."

#### *Sequestration and confiscation*

Most Jews left behind in Egypt and who are not in jail find themselves without means of support. Bank accounts have been frozen, private and commercial property sequestered, industrial and commercial firms requisitioned and Jewish employees dismissed. A once economically independent community has been reduced to poverty and want and faces a desperate future. Department stores, banks, and textile firms known throughout Egypt and the Middle East have been sequestered or confiscated. Official lists of sequestrations contain the names of hundreds of business enterprises, including such well-known and long-established firms as the Clcurel, Chemla, Hanau, and Chalons department stores; the banking houses of Zilka and Mosseri; the Pinto Cotton firm, and many others. Conservative estimates indicate the assets sequestered or frozen amount to at least \$400 million.

The principal legal device for the sequestration of Jewish property is contained in Egyptian Military Proclamation No. 4, published in the Journal Officiel No. 88 bis A of November 1, 1956. This proclamation, titled the "Administration of the Property of Persons Interned or Put Under Surveillance and Other Persons and Institutions," should be distinguished from proclamation No. 5, promulgated on the same day, which provides for the seizure and administration of assets in Egypt belonging to British, French, or Australian subjects. The very publication of proclamation No. 4 indicates that all other sequestration proclamations have some purpose apart from freezing the funds of enemy aliens.

Proclamation No. 4 is specifically addressed to the control of assets belonging to persons placed under surveillance who are not enemy nationals. It clearly contemplates the wholesale expropriation of property of state-

less Jews, Egyptian Jews, and foreign Jews whose investments and assets otherwise would have escaped sequestration.

In order to concentrate large commercial holdings exclusively in the hands of Egyptian Moslems, the provisions of article 2 of proclamation No. 4 have been widely invoked. This article authorizes the designee of the state, appointed to administer a sequestered property "to agree to a settlement or to waive the total or any part of debts owing the business \* \* \* and with the authorization of the Minister of Finance and Economy to proceed to sell the goods and to wind up any industrial or commercial enterprise or, in particular, to bring about the dissolution of the company or to acquiesce in such a dissolution."

The administrator is thus endowed with full control over the assets of the sequestered business. Debts may be forgiven at his whim, businesses may be sold and important interests may be transferred. This proclamation, moreover, goes far beyond the mere sequestration of property. It prohibits all direct or indirect transactions with any person or establishment whose property has been sequestered and bars the execution of any contract or agreement concluded by or for the benefit of such a person or establishment before the military decree was published. Finally, it has the effect of barring any person whose property has been sequestered from initiating any action in any court of Egypt or from continuing any such action already begun. Thus any firm owned or controlled by Jews is exposed to complete economic destruction. Jewish property and businesses may be seized at the whim of the administrator and transactions entered into may be retroactively nullified by the issuance of a sequestration order against which no defense is possible and from which no right of appeal exists.

The effect of giving a political functionary such absolute command over the assets of a business is to increase the opportunity for profitable side-deals and private frauds of his own. Under the law no one could question the decision of an administrator who depletes the assets of a Jewish firm in his custody through a series of disadvantageous deals with enterprises owned by Moslems. There is in addition a public purpose. The Egyptian Minister of the Interior has publicly invited Moslems to bid on shares of stock in firms sequestered from their Jewish owners. The Nasser government is thus able to advance its Egyptianization program. Under the guise of legality, it has taken properties belonging to Jews who spent their lives in developing them and placed them in the hands of Egyptian Moslems.

Proclamation No. 4 provided only the general legal authority for sequestration; within a week after its publication, implementing regulations were issued. Decree No. 170, published on November 8, 1956, listed 440 persons whose properties were to be sequestered and who were made liable to arrest and expulsion. Decree No. 171, published on November 11, mentions 25 additional persons, including the president of the Jewish community in Cairo. Decrees Nos. 174 to 196, published in the period from November 11 to 13, 1956, name 13 of the principal mercantile or commercial enterprises owned by Jews to be sequestered.

It is no accident that of the hundreds of persons who have been specifically included in decrees issued pursuant to proclamation No. 4 almost all were Jews who were either Egyptian nationals, stateless persons or nationals of countries other than Britain or France. Without the extraordinary authority of proclamation No. 4, their property could not have been touched under any regulation providing for the blocking or sequestration of the assets of enemy aliens.

In addition to the seizure of businesses under regular sequestration orders, all Jew-

ish businesses that could be construed as having the remotest connection with defense have been expropriated under a regulation permitting the requisition by the army of all firms engaged in producing military items.

These decrees have been drastically enforced. In some cases Jewish firms simply were closed and their doors sealed. In others, a representative of the Ministry of Interior, accompanied by security officers, appeared at the firm's main offices and informed the owners that the ministry had designated an administrator of the business and that all control was to be vested in his hands. Nominally, profits accruing from these operations are to be credited to the real owner and placed in his accounts, but these accounts are frozen and from present indications Egypt has no intention of returning the funds to their legal owners. Although a few Jewish-owned enterprises have been returned, notably the Cairo department store owned by the Clcurel family, the vast bulk of Jewish property is still in government hands.

The Jewish community has also been stripped of communal property. Hospitals constructed and maintained by the community have been taken over by the Egyptian army while hospitals of other religious communities have not been touched. Jewish patients were evacuated from their hospital beds. With the requisition of the Jewish hospitals, Jewish surgeons have no access to hospital facilities. Moreover, the Medical Association of Egypt has directed the Egyptian populace to refrain from consulting Jewish physicians or surgeons for any cause.

Jews in other professions have suffered the same fate as the doctors. Jewish lawyers, nationals of Egypt, have been disbarred. Jewish engineers have been denied the right to practice. Since the Jewish laboring class was dependent for its employment upon the maintenance of Jewish enterprise, the forcible closing of Jewish business and the prohibition of Jewish professional life has resulted in the virtual exclusion from employment of the whole Egyptian Jewish community.

At the present time, with only a few exceptions, Jewish businesses are not permitted to operate in Egypt under their legal owners. Jewish employees have been dismissed from all sequestered firms including foreign corporations not owned by Jews. One informant of the American Jewish Congress related that of 40 Jews employed in the office of the Shell Oil Co. in Cairo only 4 were permitted to return to their desks on the day following the appointment of a government administrator under proclamation No. 4.

No property is too small for sequestration and government functionaries have not hesitated to exploit the situation for private gain. Reporting the experiences of persons he had interviewed, Barrett McGurn wrote from Naples on January 7 in the New York Herald Tribune:

"One said that he had lost a \$55,000 printing plant. Another, born 58 years ago in Alexandria, but never an Egyptian citizen, said that he had lost a \$25,000 farm property."

"Many said that army officers and police were taking apartments which fleeing Jews were leaving. Egyptians are offering to buy the property of fleeing Jews but sometimes at merely 1 percent of value, it was reported. One boy said that his father had been offered \$125 in payment for the family's \$15,000 house."

"Most aboard were members of the lower middle class, many of them small shopkeepers, but some, according to their fellows, left as much as \$125,000 to \$600,000 in apartment houses, land, and large commercial firms."

In its determination to squeeze every bit of profit from its expellees, the Government

has even stripped them of modest private possessions. Persons searched at Egyptian airports have had to surrender even such items of personal jewelry as wristwatches, tiepins, and brooches. This relentless pressure has succeeded in forcing the Jewish community to try to sell its property for trifling sums:

"Those ordered to leave—or who, under pressure, decide to go—can take out 100 pounds (or \$280). Business and property and valuables like jewels, furniture, fur coats, are padlocked by a public custodian for future disposition.

"Naturally, deportees don't expect to hear again from the custodian. They make every effort at salvage. I was approached on a Cairo Street and offered a vast amount of currency and jewelry for my word that I would have a bank pay the deportee a trifling amount of dollars in Paris. I rejected the deal, but there is profitable traffic with these unfortunates; many participating are in government service.

"When police have the power to deal with enemy aliens they are seldom gentle, often corrupt." (World Telegram, December 28, 1956.)

American newspapers continue to report that the Egyptian Government is hamstringing for cash. (The New York Times, January 2, 1957.) A. J. Liebling in the New Yorker of January 12, 1957, noted that the economists in Egypt believe that the sequestration of British and French enterprises has yielded few tangible assets to the Egyptian Government and that for the most part these have been offset by the counterblockage of Egyptian funds in Great Britain and France. Most of the French and British firms were principally service organizations, he wrote, and all the Egyptians got with most of these properties was a heap of office furniture and their own money back.

These profitless seizures of British and French assets may account in part for the avidity and haste with which Jewish property has been despoiled. Egyptian Jews can take no countermeasures and Egypt, by looting its own nationals and stateless persons, places itself beyond the reach of international action. Whatever they wrench from the Jewish community, they take in absolute immunity. In the words of an Egyptian Jew, identified by the Associated Press as a former Egyptian industrialist who escaped to Naples:

"We are probably Egypt's most profitable export of the year. We are taking out of the country, all of us together, a few thousand pounds. We are leaving in Egypt tens and tens and tens of thousands of pounds in cash, jewelry, profitable businesses, and industries." (New York Post, January 7, 1957.)

### III. NASSERISM AND HITLERISM

The parallels between Hitler's campaign against the Jews of Germany and Nasser's attack upon the Jews of Egypt are too close to be coincidental. The anti-Jewish techniques developed in Germany are now being applied in Egypt with increasing rigor. Nasser's "Egyptianization" and Hitler's "Aryanization" programs have the same xenophobic intent and both concentrate on the Jews as their primary target.

It has already been noted that on November 20, 1936, Nasser in effect opened the door for denationalization of Egyptian Jews. Similarly, on July 26, 1933, the German Minister of Interior handed down a decree providing for the denationalization of a large percentage of German Jewish citizens. Jewish lawyers in Egypt have been disbarred, and Jewish physicians, dentists, pharmacists, architects, and other professionals have been dropped from the rolls of their professional societies and have been prevented in other ways from practicing. This duplicates a German statute of July 25, 1933, which declared that "Jews are not to be licensed as

physicians" and a subsequent decree declaring that "Jews are excluded from the practice of law."

Perhaps the closest parallels between the two regimes is to be found in the programs of economic expropriation. In November 1933, Hermann Goering decreed that "Jews . . . are excluded from the operation of individual retail businesses, exporting firms, and sales agencies" and, further, that from that date on "no Jew can manage a firm. . . ." These edicts have been paralleled by a number of Egyptian ones.

By 1938 some 120,000 German Jews were driven to migrate to other countries. Just as the Egyptian escapees are permitted to take with them a maximum of 20 Egyptian pounds (a 100 pounds according to some reports), so Jewish emigrants from Germany were divested of their possessions and permitted to carry out a maximum of 10 German marks. On all capital transferred abroad the German treasury levied a flight tax of 25 percent and allowed the remaining 75 percent to be transferred in blocked marks whose value was only one-sixth of the free mark. Nasser has gone even further: he has compelled Egyptian Jews to flee abroad in an even more destitute condition than their German predecessors.

Nasser's aim, like Hitler's aim, is first the pauperization and then the expulsion of the Jewish community. In both countries, Jewish enterprises and properties were seized to bolster an economy weakened by ruinous military expenditures. Goering, in a memorandum in 1938, cryptically noted: "Very critical situation of the Reich Exchequer. Relief through the billion [marks] imposed on Jewry, and through profits accruing to the Reich in the Aryanization of Jewish enterprises." Nasser's grandiose aims have also entailed financial outlays beyond the capacity of Egypt's economy and the expropriation of Jewish properties is a patent source of relief.

It is significant that the notorious Johann von Leers, formerly a top official of the Nazi Propaganda Ministry, occupies an important place in the Ministry of National Guidance. With such men as von Leers occupying influential posts in Nasser's government, it is not surprising that Egyptian officers and men in Sinai were found to have carried copies of an Arabic translation of Hitler's *Mein Kampf* in their knapsacks, and that an important Damascus newspaper, *Al Manar*, should have been moved to write:

"One should not forget that, in contrast to Europe, Hitler occupied an honored place in the Arab world. His name awakened in Arab hearts feelings of love and enthusiasm. The Arab world should be congratulated on producing in its midst this Hitler who has shaken the world from end to end. . . . [Journalists] are mistaken if they think that by calling Nasser Hitler they are hurting us. On the contrary, his name makes us proud. Long live Hitler, the Nazi who struck at the heart of our enemies. Long live the Hitler of the Arab world." (Quoted in the *Paris Le Monde*, August 17, 1956.)

### IV. THE ROLE OF THE UNITED NATIONS

The preamble of the Charter of the United Nations recites that—

"We, the peoples of the United Nations, determined . . . to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal right of men and women . . . do hereby establish an international organization to be known as the United Nations."

The very first article of the charter repeats this high resolve, declaring that among the stated purposes of the United Nations are "promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion. . . ." Finally, the member states of the U. N. pledge them-

selves by articles 55 and 56 of the charter to take joint and separate actions in cooperation with the U. N. to achieve universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion.

These declarations and pledges are gradually being made effective. Since its first meeting the U. N. has attempted to translate the majestic generalities of the charter into precise undertakings and ultimately to establish an international code of human rights having the effect of law. On December 10, 1948, the General Assembly without a single dissenting vote (Soviet Russia, Saudi Arabia, and six other countries abstaining) adopted the universal declaration of human rights. Among the provisions of this declaration, intended as a "common standard of achievement for all peoples and all nations," are two that are directly relevant to this study.

Article 9 of the declaration provides: "No one shall be subject to arbitrary arrest, detention, or exile."

Article 15 provides: "Everyone has the right to nationality. No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his nationality nor denied the right to change his nationality."

It is clear from the legislative history of these two provisions that the term "arbitrary" means more than "illegal" but rather any act "taken at the will and pleasure of some person who could not be called upon to show just cause for it."

The members of the United Nations have likewise been concerned with the protection of civilians during the time of war or armed conflict. At Geneva, in 1949, four conventions were signed and later ratified by most of the members of the United Nations, including Egypt and the United States. The Fourth Geneva Convention attempts to protect "the whole of the populations of the countries in conflict, without any adverse distinction based, in particular, on race, nationality, religion, or political opinion . . ." (art. 13). Article 27 of the convention in defining the rights of "protected persons" declares that they "are entitled, in all circumstances, to respect for their persons, their honor, their family rights, their religious convictions and practices, and their manners and customs." While internment is specifically allowed, it may be ordered "only if the security of the detaining power makes it absolutely necessary" (art. 42). Article 33 forbids punishment for an offense which a protected person has not "personally committed" and likewise forbids "reprisals against protected persons and their property."

While Jews in Egypt of Egyptian nationality are not protected by the Fourth Geneva Convention, Jews of British or French nationality and stateless Jews are (arts. 4 and 13).

The acts of reprisal taken against Egyptian Jewry not possessing Egyptian nationality—confiscation of property, internment, denationalization, and deportation—are all in violation of the Fourth Geneva Convention.

The United Nations has, however, failed to take any public action with respect to Egyptian Jewry. It did not request the Secretary General to investigate the grave reports that had caused so much concern. It set up no committee of inquiry. The General Assembly addressed no inquiries to Egypt. A desultory discussion was held in December 1956 and then the matter died. At no time was a resolution on Egyptian Jewry presented to the Assembly.

In other similar cases the U. N. had not been silent. Despite the opposition of the Soviet bloc, the United Nations has adopted no less than 10 different resolutions relating to the oppression of the gallant Hungarian revolutionaries. These resolutions asked for



food and medicine for the Hungarian refugees, called for an end to deportations, requested permission for U. N. observers to examine the situation in Hungary, and designated a committee to hear the testimony of Hungarian refugees.

The contrast is almost unbelievable. The nations whose hearts were justly open for Hungarian refugees could not find the time even to talk about the persecution of Egyptian Jewry.

#### V. THE ROLE OF THE UNITED STATES

The United States has expressed its concern to the Government of Egypt over the pressures exerted on British and French nationals and on the Jewish community in Egypt. On December 21, 1956, Ambassador James J. Wadsworth, the Alternate United States Representative at the United Nations, stated to the plenary session of the General Assembly:

"The United States has received information concerning the treatment of certain nationals and stateless persons in Egypt which occasions concern. It has not yet been possible to evaluate this information fully. Nor has it been possible to obtain a clarification of some aspects of the situation which are still obscure.

"The information which is presently available to my Government indicates that an indeterminate number of persons, including British and French nationals and persons of Jewish origin, in Egypt have been subjected to pressure and intimidation, and in some cases have been ordered deported. While we recognize the right of any government to take measures which are necessary in the interests of its security, the United States must express its concern at any unwarranted pressures exerted against minorities.

"The United States Ambassador in Cairo has been requested to bring to the attention of the Government of Egypt the concern of the American people over these reports.

"The United States hopes that everything possible will be done to insure that measures will not be employed which will discriminate unjustly against human beings merely on racial or religious grounds or on the basis of foreign nationality."

Mr. Wadsworth's statement was significant since it made clear that, whatever confusion existed at the time about the exact state of affairs in Egypt, there was at least sufficient evidence to warrant the United States Ambassador's intervention in Cairo. It raised the reasonable expectation that the United States Government would pursue an investigation that would substantiate or refute the charges. With the resources at their command, with the abundant data available for its study, appropriate United States agencies, it was felt, would readily ascertain the truth and assume leadership in the United Nations in the effort to cause the Egyptian Government to desist in its campaign of violence and violations of basic human freedoms.

Unfortunately, Mr. Wadsworth undermined the effect of his expression of our Government's concern by following immediately with this statement:

"I make bold to conclude with a plea. I suggest that the matter we are now discussing is not one which is likely to benefit from prolonged discussion here; certainly it will not benefit from any intemperate discussion. That is why, without in any way wishing to cut off speakers whose names have been inscribed on the list of speakers and who will follow me to the rostrum, I would suggest to them, as well as to other representatives who may desire to speak on this subject, that the most useful thing we could do would be to bring this phase of the discussion to an early end."

Since Mr. Wadsworth's declaration at the U. N. General Assembly, the United States

has not appeared to advance either in determining the facts or in rallying world opinion to the necessity of opposing firmly and immediately Egypt's contravention of fundamental human rights and liberties. In early January, in response to an appeal by the American Jewish Congress and other organizations for vigorous action to save those who are being persecuted in Egypt, the State Department, in a form letter, stated that it was still trying to obtain an accurate picture of the situation in Egypt in the light of the many conflicting assurances now being made and that the problem is being kept under active surveillance.

These sentiments, which in ordinary circumstances might have provided some comfort, can hardly allay anxiety at a time when the Egyptian Government is moving with rapidity and thoroughness to destroy the lives and liberties of the Jewish community. What is perhaps the most disappointing aspect of the State Department's response is its assertion that it is still not in full possession of the facts. The reports of Egyptian excesses have appeared in the press of virtually every non-Arabic country. In addition, there are at least 8,000 expellees from Egypt (as of January 23) who can testify from their own experience to the cruel treatment of the Jewish community of Egypt.

The conscience of the American people has been outraged by Egypt's persecution of an innocent and powerless minority and by its flagrant assault on those principles of freedom and human dignity all free nations cherish. Civic groups, church bodies, and labor and professional associations have urged the United States to take more effective diplomatic action than it has thus far.

Thus on December 16, 1956, 34 leading Christian clergymen in the United States addressed a moving appeal to President Eisenhower to seek action by the United Nations to end the persecution of Jews in Egypt. These clergymen included many of our most respected religious spokesmen, a good number of whom have been actively concerned for years in Middle Eastern problems, including the problem of providing for and resettling the Arab refugees. Their appeal stated in part:

"While we are gratified that the United States Government is expressing its deep concern to the Government of Egypt, we feel impelled to express to you our deep concern over the campaign of violence entered upon by the Government of Egypt against citizens, stateless persons, and nationals of other lands.

"In the present Egyptian program directed against the human rights, security, freedom, and economic welfare of Egyptian Jews and Jews in Egypt, a pattern has emerged that is clearly imitative of the Hitler pattern and of the present Communist pattern in Hungary. . . .

"In canceling citizenship, in ordering deportation of citizens, or stateless persons and nationals of other lands, in taking away property, in confiscating bank accounts, in the establishment of concentration camps, and in holding men and women as hostages, we find an awful and terrible imitation and refinement of the Hitler program and practices which ultimately plunged the world into war. . . .

"The United States, indeed the world, paid an appalling price to rid humanity of these evils when finally it was forced to go to war against Hitlerism. Since then, mankind has been on guard against a renewed outbreak of this malady in many lands, even in our own Nation. It is our persuasion that unless the United States opposes firmly and immediately the reappearance of racism in Egypt, in whatever guise, this pernicious evil will endanger the spiritual foundation of morality and freedom in all the world." (New York Times, December 17.)

The deep attachment of the United States to the concept of religious freedom has induced our Government in the past to intercede in instances of religious persecution and even where such intercessions entailed direct criticism of the internal legislation of other states. In 1840, in the first representation relating to Jews made by the United States to any foreign state, Secretary of State John Forsyth, at the direction of President Van Buren, instructed the American Consul at Alexandria, Egypt, to intervene in behalf of Damascus Jews who had been falsely accused of murder.

Since that time the diplomatic record is studded with instances of altruistic intervention by American officials on behalf of persecuted Jewish populations abroad. The United States, for example, protested on behalf of the Jews in Morocco in 1863, to Persia in 1897, to Russia in 1908, to Syria and Palestine in 1915, to Italy in 1938, and to Argentina in 1943. In the Nazi era, the United States Government utilized available diplomatic channels to protest the atrocities of Hitler's regime.

In 1878 Secretary of State William Evarts interceded in Morocco, despite an awareness that his action might be construed as improper. In accord with America's finest ideal of compassion for the victims of suffering and oppression, he wrote the American Consul in Morocco: "Still, there might be cases in which humanity would dictate a disregard of technicalities, if your influence would shield Hebrews from oppression." It is in this traditional spirit of humanity and understanding that we ought to approach the agony the Jewish community is undergoing in Egypt today.

#### VI. CONCLUSION

Once again, a Jewish community has been doomed to destruction by a brutal dictatorship.

For many weeks Jewish leaders had been assured by their governments and by the spokesmen of international organizations that the Egyptian dictatorship had undertaken only a limited action against a handful of Jews as a precautionary measure justified by emergency war conditions. These statements were made and widely disseminated on the basis of replies to inquiries addressed to the Egyptian Government and its leading members. Today it is all too clear that behind this propaganda of calculated deception the Egyptian Government was engaged in the task of uprooting the Jewish community and making its further existence impossible.

A substantial number of Jews whose families had resided in Egypt for generations were denationalized; many Jews of all nationalities were served with orders of expulsion; thousands were subjected to intimidation and pressure with the object of compelling them to apply for permission to depart. In order to insure that this deliberate creation of a new refugee problem should not evoke protests from international public opinion, those who had expulsion orders were deprived of them before departure and they, as well as all who left, were compelled to sign statements certifying that they were going voluntarily. The victims of this lawless and vicious process were deprived of their possessions and were allowed to take with them only trivial sums and personal effects needed on the journey. Hundreds of those who have reached lands of refuge have testified that they were taken from prison or concentration camps, often in shackles, to the ships, and subjected to indignities on the way.

Over 8,000 of such refugees, out of a total Jewish population of approximately 50,000, have now reached lands of freedom. This steady stream threatens to become a flood unless in the meantime international au-

thorities exert themselves in an effort to halt it.

An element of major importance in the scheme of persecution elaborated by the Egyptian authorities has been the sequestration of Jewish properties. Orders were promulgated authorizing the appropriate military authority to sequester the property not only of enemy aliens but of any other persons whom this authority at its unfettered discretion might designate. As a result, hundreds of properties and enterprises, belonging in whole or in part to Jews, and among them some of the most important in the country, have been taken over by the government. No distinction has been made on grounds of nationality. Among the victims are Egyptian citizens, stateless persons, foreigners of various nationalities other than and in addition to British and French nationals. Every Jewish enterprise of any significance has, in fact, been sequestered under those orders.

Closely associated with this process of sequestration has been the deliberate impoverishment of the great mass of Egyptian Jewry by depriving it of the means of livelihood. Jews have been dismissed or suspended without compensation from posts in all public enterprises and services. The same fate has overtaken Jewish employees in the sequestered enterprises and businesses. Non-Jewish employers have been forced, often against their will, to dismiss Jewish employees. Jewish professionals have through various devices been deprived of the right to practice. The result has been that a once prosperous community has been reduced in a few weeks to the status of paupers.

Jewish communities everywhere have been profoundly shaken by the apparent helplessness of the U. N. in the presence of this great human tragedy. Not a single authoritative voice has been raised on behalf of the Egyptian Jews by the international community in public protest. There have been

sincere efforts made privately by international diplomacy and democratic governments to urge counsels of moderation on the Egyptian regime, but they have apparently failed.

The Egyptian Government has worked out its anti-Jewish designs with the aid of notorious Nazis and with the aid of techniques elaborated by the Hitler regime. It has pursued these designs in flagrant contravention of international agreements which it has helped to draft and which it has ratified. Adapting the Nazi methods to the Egyptian scene, the Nasser regime has enacted special legislation to give the color of legalism to its inhumanities; it has taken hostages from Jewish families in order to silence the victims who have escaped.

The process of spoliation and persecution was undertaken not during the conflict with Israel but after the U. N. intervened to save the Nasser regime from destruction. The cease-fire became effective on November 6 but the sequestration order is dated November 8. The new nationality law, which stripped many Jews of Egyptian nationality on the flimsiest pretexts, dates from November 20.

The implications of Egypt's campaign to end the existence of the Jewish community should be seriously pondered by the free peoples of the world. It should be recalled that the Nazi regime struck out first at the Jews and then proceeded against other groups. Similarly, the assault by the Nasser regime on the Jews, its most defenseless minority, inaugurates a process which can extend to every group which bars the way to the grandiose Pan-Arabic design under Egyptian leadership, articulated in Nasser's book *The Philosophy of the Revolution*.

For the leaders of the free world to ignore these portents, is to do so at the peril of world peace. In these circumstances, apart from the dictates of humanity and compassion, apart from preserving the cherished ideals of freedom and liberty, it is a matter

of enlightened self-interest for the international community and all democratic governments to intervene energetically to halt the destruction of the Egyptian Jewish community.

This solemn obligation is one which the United States Government should in particular assume. The United States Government was a bulwark of support for the Nasser regime in the recent crisis. It has become a beacon of hope for all groups throughout the world who chafe under tyranny and oppression. Its prestige would be tarnished by failure to act in a situation which so palpably calls for the United States Government's immediate action.

There are three courses which the United States Government can pursue and which all men who abhor violence, cruelty and oppression will enthusiastically endorse.

First, the President of the United States should remind the Government of Egypt directly of its obligation as a member of the United Nations and of the civilized community to abandon its present course of inhuman oppression of its Jewish population, to cease and desist from its acts of arrest, economic strangulation, persecution and deportation.

Second, the United States delegation to the United Nations should take the lead in the General Assembly in calling for action consistent with the Charter of the United Nations and with the several international compacts to which Egypt is a signatory that expressly guarantee respect for fundamental human rights.

Third, the Government of the United States should extend this country's tradition of sanctuary and haven to the Egyptian refugees. It should use the existing authority exercised by the Attorney General under the immigration laws on behalf of Hungarian refugees in a similar fashion on behalf of those Jews and stateless persons in Egypt who have been deported or compelled to leave.

#### APPENDIX

*Arrivals of refugee Jews from Egypt, Nov. 22, 1956-Jan. 23, 1957, ports, dates of disembarkation and number of refugees*

Name of vessel	Piraeus	Number	Naples	Number	Marseilles	Number
<i>Askania</i>			Nov. 22, 1956	4		
<i>Achilauis</i>			Nov. 30, 1956	250		
<i>Marseillaise</i>					Nov. 30, 1956	250
<i>Al Sudan</i>			Dec. 4, 1956	21		
<i>Espéria</i>			Dec. 5, 1956	80		
<i>Korinthia</i>			Dec. 7, 1956	145	Dec. 9, 1956	60
<i>Sultan</i>			Dec. 8, 1956	18		
<i>Enostica</i>			Dec. 12, 1956	80		
<i>Achilauis</i>			Dec. 14, 1956	350		
<i>Aolia</i>			do	240	Dec. 16, 1956	180
<i>Misir</i>			do	103		
<i>Jugoslavia</i>					Dec. 18, 1956	140
<i>Espéria</i>			Dec. 18, 1956	50		
<i>Nefretiti</i>			Dec. 19, 1956	40		
<i>Achilauis</i>			Dec. 21, 1956	150	Dec. 23, 1956	230
<i>Lydia</i>					Dec. 22, 1956	150
<i>Al Sudan</i>			Dec. 21, 1956	380		
<i>Argentina</i>			Dec. 22, 1956	20		
<i>Pasteur</i>					Dec. 25, 1956	100
<i>Korinthia</i>			Dec. 27, 1956	73		
By 8 different vessels till Dec. 27, 1956		250				
<i>Jugoslavia</i>			Dec. 29, 1956	20	Dec. 31, 1956	200
<i>Achilauis</i>	Dec. 31, 1956	20	Jan. 1, 1957	45	Jan. 2, 1957	385
<i>Espéria</i>			do	130		
<i>Nefretiti</i>			do	45		
<i>Aolia</i>	Dec. 31, 1956	20	Jan. 2, 1957	20	Jan. 4, 1957	250
<i>Misir</i>			Jan. 6, 1957	967		
<i>Jugoslavia</i>					Jan. 7, 1957	200
<i>Carinthia</i>	Jan. 18, 1957	72	Jan. 19, 1957	30	Jan. 21, 1957	180
<i>Jugoslavia</i>					Jan. 20, 1957	130
<i>Aolia</i>					Jan. 21, 1957	100
<i>Misir</i>	Jan. 23, 1957	857				
Total:						
Greece				1,219		
Italy				3,261		
France				2,555		
Total				7,035		
Estimated arrivals during same period by plane in Italy, Switzerland, France, and Great Britain				1,400		
Total				8,435		



Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Celler] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. Celler. Mr. Speaker, as I listened to President Eisenhower's speech on Wednesday night last, one overriding thought stayed with me—how brave, how courageous was United States policy vis-a-vis Israel. Here we are, a nation of 170 million people, the most powerful, the richest in the world, bringing all our weight to bear upon a little state of a million and a half people, the weakest and most isolated of all democracies, a state not even as large as Massachusetts, let us say.

Here we were, bringing all our pressure to bear and literally begging that the rest of the world join us in this tremendous display of strength against a tiny segment of the world which, for 8 years, has struggled against Arab hostility and acts of aggression. Israel asked as a condition precedent to her withdrawal from the Gaza Strip and Sharm-el-Sheik that she be permitted, along with all the other nations of the world, free and innocent passage through international waterways. She asks that she be guaranteed protection against the organized Egyptian fedayeen raids which took daily toll of lives and property. The Arab world attacked Israel when she declared her statehood, and since that time, Israel has lived through many heartbreak hazards. Her ships were barred from the Suez Canal. A sustained economic boycott drained her economy. Daily raids took her young and despoiled her produce.

These were facts well known to our President—or should have been—and to the rest of the world; yet not one single move was made nor one step taken to help Israel to maintain her national existence. True, the United Nations Security Council passed a resolution in 1951 calling on Egypt to stop the blocking of Israeli ships in the Suez Canal. The United States itself had voted for that resolution. Egypt ignored it for 6 years. There was no talk of sanctions against Egypt. Indeed, the President himself, only a few weeks ago, stated that he did not even know there was such a resolution. How brave and how resolute we are now.

There was another thought that occurred to me during the President's speech. In all kinds of international crises, he has called for patience. For years now the United States has been negotiating with Communist China for prisoner release. We have been holding fruitless conversation after conversation with the Soviet Union. Only with little Israel was the President's patience rapidly evaporated. Even while the talks were going on between the United States and Israel, between Israel and United Nations officials, the President took to the air in righteous indignation

against the smallest of nations, inviting the world to join with the United States in bringing sanctions to bear upon the one vital spark of democracy in the Middle East. Was this not the very quintessence of patience?

Certainly no sanctions were voted against the Soviet Union for its Hungarian invasion, or against India for its annexation of Kashmir. The President did not take to the air to urge the imposition of sanctions against these aggressive acts. One needs to be careful of stepping on the toes of a big boy. One need not be quite so careful about the toes of a little boy.

Israel has not said she will not withdraw. She has not made a mockery of United Nations resolutions as has the Soviet Union and, in the latest instance, India. She asks only firm guarantees that those conditions which provoked the attack will be removed. If the United Nations resolutions are to have any meaning at all, any substance, then it is mandatory that it recognize the history which led to the present crisis.

Let us consider for a moment that Israel withdraws unconditionally and Egypt continues her raids, continues her blocking of the Straits of Aqaba and the Suez Canal to Israeli shipping. What then? Is it, therefore, not more sensible to recognize now that these conditions have existed and, in the face of Arab hostility, will exist in the future, and take preventive action now instead of inviting another disaster all over again?

We cannot advocate other procedures dependent upon Egypt's consent, as we seem to have been doing. We know, or should know, that this consent of Egypt will not be forthcoming. It took Israel's march into Egypt for the world to wake up to the punishment Israel had taken these many years from a hostile Arab world. Had policy been firm before this, the attack would never have been necessary. We have not shown our faith heretofore. Is it any wonder, then, that our faith is questioned by Israel? The moral indignation of the President against Israel hardly becomes us.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from California on his very penetrating and thoughtful analysis of the terribly dangerous situation in the Middle East, and to commend him, too, for the constructive solutions that he has offered.

If law and justice are to mean anything, there cannot be a double standard under which small nations are penalized while larger and more powerful nations maintain their defiance with impunity. Russia has ignored United Nations resolutions on Hungary, India has refused to abide by them in Kashmir, and Egypt remains stubbornly defiant on the issue of Israeli shipping through the Suez Canal. Yet the United Nations has been either unwilling or powerless to impose any penalties against these nations.

To apply sanctions now against Israel alone would be a mockery of the basic principle of the United Nations that all

nations are equal before it, and would represent little more than using the U. N. as an instrument of coercion by those who are in fact far more eager to render Israel helpless than to uphold valid principles of universal justice.

I would like to ask the gentleman from California this question. This House has recently received from the administration a request for very prompt action on a resolution sent up by the administration asking congressional backing for certain action that the administration feels it might be obliged to take in the Middle East on some future date. Specifically, House Joint Resolution 117 asked for our concurrence in the administration's being prepared to resist open armed Communist aggression in the Middle East. This House did act with great promptness, and has given the administration the assurance it sought, even though the area that was the subject of that resolution was an area traditionally within the confines of the Executive. This House acted with such promptness because the administration had said on an important, indeed a vital matter, of our foreign policy it wanted national solidarity. Here we have a situation discussed by the gentleman from California where the administration is apparently proposing the use of sanctions against Israel without at the same time insisting on a settlement of some of the other elements such as the Egyptian raids and the closing of the Gulf of Aqaba, which brought about the Israeli action in the first place. My question is this: Does not the gentleman think that a parity of reasoning would require the administration to come up here and sample the sense of Congress on what it proposes to do in this vital Middle Eastern problem, right here and now, in view of the fact that the administration has seen fit to come up and get congressional assent to much vaguer and more general action which it may in the future contemplate in the Middle East?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I would say in answer to the question of my distinguished friend from Wisconsin that while it would follow logically that what he has suggested should be done, I think in view of the absence of a bipartisan foreign policy, the bipartisan opposition which has already been demonstrated to the proposal that consideration be given to sanctions, has made it very clear to the Secretary of State and to the administration that they just would not get that approval from Congress; so I am afraid that we will not get the opportunity actually to express our opinion much, of course, as I would like to see it done.

Mr. REUSS. I thank the gentleman. Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, with others of my colleagues who have spoken, I wish to commend the gentleman from California, Mr. ROOSEVELT, and the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. BOYLE, for their action in getting unanimous consent for 2 full hours of debate on the situation in the Middle East, especially as it revolves around the State of

Israel. I have listened with rapt attention and an applauding heart to the address of the distinguished gentleman from California, Mr. ROOSEVELT. It was an address scholarly in its reasoning and eloquently moving in its presentment. I find myself in entire agreement with the gentleman's conclusions.

I think at this point it would be helpful to the men and women of the country who are not here but will be reading in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an account of what we now are doing to explain the nature of the present proceeding. There is no bill or resolution now before us. There is nothing upon which we shall be called upon to vote. The gentleman from California and the gentleman from Illinois had obtained unanimous consent each to address the House for 1 hour at the conclusion of the legislative business of the day. They invited other members of the House to share with them the 2 hours that they had been granted. Members are on the floor at this time so to participate.

What is the reason for what we are doing? The President not long ago spoke to the American people on the subject of sanctions against Israel. We in the Congress today are speaking for the constituents in our respective districts and our words will go out to the country and to the world and be part of the permanent record of these times in the volumes of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In a broad sense we in this Chamber today, are speaking in a court of American public opinion.

The cause of Israel is very close to the hearts of the American people. The security of the State of Israel is entwined with the security of our own country. In that troubled area of the world the Middle East Israel stands for everything for which we have stood in the long role of our history. International morality, no less than fidelity to our own traditions, command that, as Alderman Leon Despres expressed it in a letter to me, we should not quail before the strong in order to flail the weak. In every American mind the thought of the United States joining in a move to impose unilateral sanctions on the little State of Israel, our friend, is repulsive. Always have we in our national existence followed the moral law. That is the source of our strength, and unless we continue rigidly to follow the moral law in all our relations with other nations and other peoples we will not meet the large responsibility of world leadership that has been given us by providence.

The State of Israel has a right to live and a right to its opportunity to make its contribution to the job of all nations, the job of making this a better world for all mankind.

It is unfortunate that at the present time the Arab world does not understand that from the State of Israel, its growth and its prosperity, will come to the peoples of the Arab nations only an abundance of blessings. The State of Israel and the people of Israel are bringing into that troubled area an outpost of the industrial order that is responsible for the scintillating success of what once was called the American experiment. Our cities grew great and rich as industrial

centers, and from them came the buying power that made possible the rich development of the agricultural regions. So will it be in the Middle East. The State of Israel will establish in that area a great industrial center and from this center will come the buying power to bring the agricultural development of the Arab States to a plane far above that of which they ever had dreamed. The fact is, and it should be as plain as the hand before one's face, that the State of Israel and the Arab States are partners in a great undertaking, a glorious adventure that can only end in making a region now troubled and peopled largely by the children of poverty again a Garden of Eden. All that is needed now is understanding. It is our mission to aid in the reaching of that understanding.

But we cannot lead the hearts and the minds of people unless we are strong and courageous in avoiding expediency and in insisting upon the application in every situation of the moral law to which we give our faith.

When we were a young Nation, and it would have been expedient for us to buy for our sailors a temporary freedom from harassment the inspired words were born: "Millions for defense; not 1 cent for tribute."

They inspired the Americans of that period and they have inspired every generation of Americans that has followed. The course of our history very well might have been different if in that early stage we had sold the moral law at the price of expediency.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if our present approach does not amount to an enthronement of expediency rather than an uncompromising insistence upon the application of the moral law even in areas and with peoples temporarily lacking understanding that it is all for their ultimate good albeit at the moment unpopular.

I wonder, too, if we are not departing from the very spirit of that good old American slogan, "Millions for defense and not 1 cent for tribute." It can be said in all truth that what we are offering the Arab States is tribute. If it is money we give them for the development of their own economies so that all the peoples of those countries can be elevated, that is all for the good. Wherever we strike at poverty and need, we strike at the causes of war. Wherever we remove poverty and elevate the standard of living among people we are advancing not only the interest of those people but the interest of our own people. That I think too is self-evident. He who casts bread upon the waters will have it returned to him many fold.

But when we give money to one nation and that nation insists upon kicking around another and a smaller nation, and nevertheless we go on handing it money, that is tribute. That is violative of the moral law. It mocks at every American tradition. Pursuing such a course we can only end without the respect either of the nations that do not like us or of the nations that for expediency profess friendship.

When Secretary of State Dulles was before the Committee on Foreign Affairs,

then having under consideration House Joint Resolution 117, I asked whether there was danger that to obtain the cooperation of the Arab States in the proposed program, concessions would be made to those States injurious to the State of Israel. You will find the reply that Secretary Dulles gave to my question on page 145 of the printed hearings of the Committee on Foreign Affairs on House Joint Resolution 117. I quote the Secretary's exact words:

I can assure you, sir, that we shall not in any application of this policy or any of our discussions with the Arab countries do anything whatsoever that would detract from the statements so often made by this administration and others and by the Congress that the preservation of the State of Israel is a vital part of the United States foreign policy.

Coming from the Secretary of State, a gentleman for many years of high standing in public life and for a time a Member of the United States Senate, I accepted those words in all good faith. I gave the Secretary full credit for a direct answer, without any mincing of words he gave his pledge that this administration would do nothing to endanger the preservation of the State of Israel. Yet today, only a few weeks after he gave that pledge to the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, he is reported to be favorable to imposing unilateral sanctions on the State of Israel on the demand of the Arab States that openly declare that the State of Israel shall not be allowed to exist. I hope and I pray that the attitude of the Secretary of State has not been correctly reported.

This country wants in every legitimate way to help the peoples of the Arab States. We wish the rulers of the Arab States all to be our friends, and we wish to work with them in the attainment of goals of mutual interest. But we cannot buy their friendship at the price of betraying a friend. Even if we did we could not expect to gain their respect or their trust since always they would have in mind that if to curry favor we abandoned one friend the time might come when to curry favor in another quarter we would abandon them.

When we were young we were not afraid to tackle Great Britain when she insisted on her self-proclaimed right to seize American sailors from vessels on the high sea and subject them to British law. How, then, can we criticize the government and the people of Israel for being as redblooded under exactly similar circumstances as were we in our national youth? The oceans of world commerce belong to the ships of all nations. That is moral law and that is international law. We do violence to the reputation of our own country as a world leader if we retreat 1 inch from an insistence upon the universal recognition of that moral and that international law.

The reputation of nations, as well as of men, is built on character. The man who is not loyal to the members of his own family cannot be trusted to be loyal to the community composed of his own and other families. So is it with nations, which are made up of many families woven into one organized society for a common purpose of advancement.



What would be thought of us by the peoples of the rest of the world, all as human as are we and measuring themselves and others by the same scale of human valuations, if we abandoned Israel, our friend, to the designs of her enemies? What would be the low esteem in which an individual family would be held in the community of which it was a part if it betrayed another family in the same community in the hope of currying favor with another and remote community?

He who is not steadfast in loyalty to his own cannot be trusted to remain loyal to anyone. As it is with individuals so is it with nations.

In our foreign policy we have retreated too far from principle in the excuse of expediency. In the matter of passports, in the matter of respecting the bigotry of other nations instead of adhering to our own religious tolerance in the stationing of our own armed personnel in other lands, we have sold the American heritage for a mess of pottage.

To regain the respect of others we must recapture our own self-respect. Respectfully and earnestly, I suggest that we as a Nation begin by proclaiming to all the world that the foreign policy of the United States is built upon the moral law and the qualities of virtue, the greatest of which is loyalty. We cannot abandon Israel to her enemies without abandoning our own self-respect. We cannot continue to permit in any land that calls itself our friend a differentiation among American citizens according to the faith in which they approach an understanding of the divinity. We cannot longer permit any land that calls itself our friend to say that some of the American family can come and some of the family, but of a minority religion, cannot come. We must stand before the world as a united family, and the nation that will not accept one part of the family on the same measure of character as others of the same family cannot expect to treat with us as a friend until it mends its ways.

For peace and understanding, for the advancement of friendship among nations and peoples, we will give freely of ourselves and of our means. But never must we abandon principle or by accepting the dictum of another nation's bigotry to drive wedges into the unity of American toleration and brotherhood.

Should we invoke sanctions against Israel at this point we would confess either to absolute ignorance of the events which have led to the present Arab-Israeli crisis, or to an abdication of principles for which the United States has stood.

Let us look at the record.

May 14, 1948 the State of Israel was born. Immediately Egypt began economic war upon her with seizure of ships of any nation carrying goods to or from Israel. Egypt searched the ships of Norway, Holland, Italy and the United States and confiscated their cargoes, including not only items on a contraband list but also frozen meats and other foods, even motorcycles.

July 11, 1951, Israel presented her case before the Security Council of the United

Nations. The Security Council held that Egyptian restrictions represented unjustified interference with the rights of nations to navigate the seas and to trade freely with one another. The resolution of the Security Council concluded by calling upon Egypt "to terminate the restrictions on the passage of international commercial shipping and goods through the Suez Canal wherever bound."

In February 1954 a New Zealand resolution noted with grave concern Egypt's lack of compliance with the 1951 Security Council resolution and called upon her to honor that resolution in accordance with her obligations under the Charter of the U. N. Eight of 11 Council members supported the New Zealand resolution, but it failed of adoption because of the veto of the U. S. S. R.

Egypt continued her practice of search, seizure, and confiscation in violation of international law and the resolution of the United Nations.

In an attempt to maintain economic life Israel turned to the Gulf of Aqaba, which has the status of an international waterway and therefore should be open to the commerce of all nations.

The Egyptian Government fortified two islands at the mouth of the gulf. In January 1950 the American Embassy at Cairo sent a note of inquiry to the Egyptian Government. The reply was:

This passage (through the Straits of Tiran) will remain free as in the past in conformity with international practice and with the recognized principle of international law.

However, as it affected Israel, promise was one thing, practice another.

Using fortified islands to prey upon international commerce constitutes piracy. When the pirates of North Africa demanded tribute as the price of free access to international waters our answer was: "Millions for defense, not 1 cent for tribute." Have we so far retreated from our moral plane when we were young as a nation that we will vote sanctions against a now young nation which is struggling to maintain freedom of navigation of international waters even as did we against the Barbary pirates and later against England in the War of 1812? Mr. Speaker, the answer of the American people as reflected in my correspondence and that of my colleagues in the Congress is a thunderous "No."

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, one of the virtues of democracy is that the right of free criticism can frequently bring about modifications and improvements in the direction of public policy.

I believe that constructive criticism by Members of the House and Senate is having that effect on American policy in the Middle East, and I am glad to note that the administration is making strenuous efforts to reach a reasonable settlement in the difficult Middle East situation. Such a settlement will bring an end to the suggestion of a United Nations resolution imposing sanctions

against Israel. It is to be hoped that present negotiations will be successful and that the United States will, in any event, oppose sanctions against Israel.

When reference is made to the provision of the United Nations Charter outlawing force as a means of securing national objectives, it should not be overlooked that force was used to bar Israeli shipping from the Suez Canal and the Gulf of Aqaba. In seeking a settlement, a fair and impartial attitude must be maintained, and the nations which have resorted to force should be asked to give ground simultaneously and with fair equality. This must be the objective, rather than to expect Israel to withdraw first, and then trust to the United Nations to secure justice, a trust which is not justified by past experience.

Secretary Dulles was frank in admitting this at his news conference on February 19 when he said:

Whereas . . . the decision of the Security Council of 1951, that Israeli ships are entitled to go through the canal, was allowed to be disregarded at that time, I think that for the future there will be a greater effort to secure, through the concerted influence of the nations of the world, a compliance with such decisions embodying principles of right and justice. . . .

I think we are going through what may prove to be a very significant stage in the development of an international order. And if the world can get through this present stage by liquidating the armed attack, and then following that with a more vigilant effort by the United Nations and its members to preserve and secure the satisfaction of other rights under international law, I think we will have made one of the greatest forward steps in history in the development of an international order.

It is on the question of the order in which these events should take place that the greatest difficulty has arisen. I again submit views which I stated to the House on February 20:

I believe that a way must be found to have Israel and Egypt give ground simultaneously and with fair equality until a basis is laid for peaceful coexistence. If the United Nations is to insist on commitments from Israel, it should also insist that Egypt agree to end the stated of armed truce and blockade, and grant freedom of passage to Israeli shipping in the Suez Canal and Gulf of Aqaba. There must be no return to the status quo existing before the recent hostilities.

As the situation develops from day to day and from hour to hour, it becomes clear that our Government is working in that direction. It is only fair to recognize the practical difficulties. Mr. Walter Lippmann has pointed to the paralyzing effects of voting blocs in the United Nations. The result is that while a resolution critical of one side to the dispute might find easy passage, one critical of the other side might face defeat.

It is to be hoped that future emphasis will be not on criticism, not on re-creation for past actions, but on a settlement that will reach the fundamental issues, and will lead to the strengthening of the rule of law among nations.

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield.

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman from California for his able and fair presentation of the facts in the matter of the current dispute in the Middle East. I can only add that it adds honor to the proud name which the gentleman bears that as in the past he too is fighting that justice may prevail not only here but throughout the world.

I would like to ask the gentleman, in his opinion would it not seem that this would be an appropriate time, if the President's prestige is at a new alltime peak as I read in *Time* magazine and other periodicals, with the Afro-Asian bloc that he use that prestige of his office to get the Arab nations to sit down and merely admit the fact that Israel is a state; that it is a state that was established by the United Nations and that it is here to stay and that it is to the interest of the Arab nations, as well as to the peace of the world, that they recognize this fact so that they can work together and bring peace and prosperity to the Middle East.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman. I think it would be well to point out that the recent visit from the King of Saudi Arabia would have been an excellent chance to have begun that work, when we had a few cards on our side of the fence. I hope that we shall have that kind of leadership in the future.

Mr. MACDONALD. I again wish to compliment the gentleman; and, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, there has been a good deal of talk recently about the tiny country of Israel being an aggressor, of her being unreasonable in failing to heed the U. N. demands to evacuate her troops from the positions she presently occupies on what has been considered Egyptian territory in the Gaza Strip and Sharm el Sheikh.

Certainly it is true that technically speaking Israel has been guilty of aggressive action against Egypt. And though all parties still deny it, if she did not work in concert with England and France, the fortuitous timing of the attack was the greatest coincidence of our time.

However as that might be, I feel that the United States Government would be in grievous error to embark on a course of action which would put pressure on Israel to abandon her recent gains, without guaranties from Egypt that there would be no further "fedayeen" raids and that the blockade of the Gulf of Aqaba would cease. I feel strongly that this Congress would be compounding the error if we did not protest any such contemplated action. To understand Israel's unique position in October of 1956, is to forgive her so-called acts of aggression, which in the opinion of many, and in my own opinion, was not so much an act of aggression as an act of aggressive self-defense.

Eight years after its war of independence the State of Israel still faces a security problem of unusual complexity. The area of the country is only 8,100 square miles. Owing to the peculiar shape of its territory there are more than 400 miles of frontier. Three-quarters of the population of Israel lives in the coastal plain, running from north of Haifa to south of Tel Aviv, with a slender branch heading to Jerusalem. This densely settled area has an average width of no more than 12 miles between the Mediterranean and the Jordanian border. From the Israel Parliament buildings in Jerusalem, the armed sentries of the Jordanian Arab Legion can be seen a few hundred yards away. The headquarters of the Israel General Staff are within clear view from the hills which mark the Jordan frontier. The country's main roads and railways are exposed to swift and easy attack. Scarcely anywhere in Israel can a man live, or work, beyond the very easy range of enemy fire. Indeed, except in the Negev, no settlement is at a distance of more than 20 miles from an Arab frontier.

Obviously then, the term "frontier security" has little meaning in the context of Israel's geography. The entire country is a frontier, and the whole rhythm of national life is affected by any hostile activity from the territory of neighboring states. On the other hand, the Arab States, especially Egypt, are in no such position. Border tensions affect only a narrow fringe of their territories, beyond which stretch deep hinterlands entirely remote from the hazards and strains of frontier life. An American citizen who can cross our vast continent without seeing a hostile face, requires a highly unusual measure of imagination to understand the degree of vulnerability which geography imposes upon the people of Israel.

The effects of geographical vulnerability are aggravated by fierce antagonism, directed against Israel across her embattled frontiers. There is no other state in the world whose very right to existence is so persistently challenged by all its contiguous neighbors. This is not the classic pattern of international conflict, in which neighboring peoples recognize each other's statehood but are divided by specific disputes which they have failed to reconcile. The struggle between the Arab States and Israel has been constant yet has passed through four phases: First, before 1948, there was a determination by the Arab States to prevent the establishment of an independent Israel; second, in 1948, there was an unsuccessful attempt to destroy Israel's independence at its birth by armed assault; third, in the period 1948-54, there has been an attitude of inveterate revenge based on nonrecognition and the undying hope of Israel's extinction; fourth, Egypt, as leader of the Arab world, has embarked on a special arms-seeking policy in which it invited arms from Communist sources. The elementary duty of members of the United Nations to recognize each other's right to sovereignty and integrity has never been found in the relations of the Arab world with Israel.

In order to really understand Israel's need for guaranties against further aggression, it is necessary to take into consideration the expressed intentions of the leaders of Israel's foes against the Israelis. The secretary general of the Arab League said:

This war (in 1948) against Israel will be a war of extermination and a momentous massacre which will be spoken of like the Mongolian massacre.

Indeed, these are not just warlike words as is shown by the fact that the Arab attack, especially in its first guerrilla stage, did not lack instances of disregard of the rules of war, for not one single Jew survives in any part of Palestine that came to be occupied by the invading Arab armies. The Jewish quarter in the old city of Jerusalem, with its ancient synagogues and monuments, was completely destroyed; even the Jewish cemetery of the Mount of Olives was desecrated and laid waste.

The then President of Egypt, Naguib, said on April 18, 1953:

The existence of Israel is a cancer in the body of the Arab Nation.

Following this unthinking train of thought, the man who succeeded Naguib, the former colonel and current President, Nasser, said on May 8, 1954:

Israel is an artificial State which must disappear.

Another Arab leader, Mohammed Salah-ad-Din said recently:

The Arabs will not be satisfied with the implementation of United Nations resolutions. We shall only have complete satisfaction when Israel is finally blotted out from the map of the Middle East. The Arabs will find no rest until this cancer has been removed from their heart.

In another sphere—an economic sphere—hostility has long been shown the State of Israel by the Arab world. From the very inception of the State of Israel, an economic boycott has been enforced against it by the Arab States, the most significant aspect of which was the closing of the Suez Canal to all Israel shipping, and the interference with the passage of ships of other nations carrying cargoes to Israel. This action of the Egyptian Government was a violation of the Constantinople Convention of 1888 under which the power contiguous to the Suez Canal is bound to keep the canal—in the words of this convention:

Always \* \* \* free and open in time of war as in times of peace, to every vessel of commerce or war without distinction of flag.

A widely ramified boycott machinery was set up with headquarters in Cairo to prevent trade between the Arab States and Israel—indeed, between Israel and other countries. International firms trading with Israel were blacklisted, airlines and shipping companies are denied servicing in Arab airports and harbors if they insist on maintaining contact with Israel. A conspicuous example of this policy was the campaign of intimidation conducted by the Arab States against the German Federal Republic which had signed a reparations agreement with Israel. Danger to international air traffic has been caused by the



refusal of Arab airports to provide flight information to aircraft proceeding to or from Israel. The boycott of the Arab States against Israel extends even to the denial of information on the movement of infectious disease or locusts.

Is it, therefore, unreasonable that Israel, in her isolation—the only democratic country in the world so isolated—should seek guaranties against further aggression?

The situation in the Middle East has deteriorated where it now constitutes one of our weakest security links. Our lack of firmness, our obvious indecisiveness for a long period of time has now brought us to a position where we now face Soviet penetration of the Middle East.

Now we have a new method of obtaining peace in the Middle East. It has been suggested that we apply pressures, within the framework of the United Nations to force Israel to withdraw troops from the Gaza Strip and the Gulf of Aqaba. These are the same troops who have provided her with her only form of protection against the fedayeen raids of her neighbors in carrying out the spirit of the Arab world which resisted the notion that Israel is a sovereign state.

Who are the people who are pressing for sanctions against the independent State of Israel? It would seem clear that the most vociferous cries raised against Israel are being emitted by those who have ignored the will of the United Nations when it suited their own interests to do so.

Were sanctions applied against India when it used naked force in Kashmir? Were sanctions instituted against Russia when her heavy tanks slaughtered thousands upon thousands of liberty-loving Hungarians in the most sordid mass homicide in recent history? The answer is of course so obvious that one can only believe that the answer lies in the words of Cartoonist Herblock: "The way of a little transgressor is hard."

There have been no reasons advanced as to why Israel should give up what she's won without any guaranties that Egypt will not inevitably attack in the future. However, there are abundant reasons for her to believe that a mere U. N. condemnation will not deter the Arab world from carrying out its avowed intention to destroy Israel.

In 1951 the Security Council of the United Nations found that Egyptian interference with the passage of goods destined for Israel through the Suez Canal was inconsistent with the purpose of the armistice agreement between Israel and the Arab States and called on Egypt to terminate all such restrictions.

As a matter of fact the U. N. Security Council passed a resolution calling on Egypt to stop the practice of blocking Israeli ships in the Suez Canal. The Egyptian Government has successfully defied this resolution for 6 years even though the United States voted for and strongly backed this reasonable resolution. No so-called pressures or sanctions were imposed on Egypt at that time. Could it be that we have developed two views of international justice—one to be applied to strong nations and one to be applied to weak nations?

Certainly we all hope that the Government of the United States has not reached the point of view that might makes right. In urging President Eisenhower and our State Department to reconsider its newspaper-announced views, I can only point to the President's own words, spoken at the time of the invasion of Egypt in November, and ask him to carry them through. He then said: "We cannot subscribe to one law for the weak and another for the strong."

For again, in President Eisenhower's own words, it is my very strong opinion that if we do, "there will be no peace" in the Middle East.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I would like to commend the gentleman from California for taking up this very important matter at this time. As the gentleman knows, I have always opposed sanctions against Israel. I am very glad the gentleman is talking in opposition to sanctions against the little State of Israel. Might does not make right, and in this case Israel is right.

On previous occasions, both on the floor of the House and in various communications, I have expressed my total and unqualified opposition to the employment of sanctions against Israel. I am still strongly opposed to any such measures being adopted by the United States. I am opposed to the employment of sanctions for the following reasons.

First, I do not accept the premises upon which arguments in favor of the employment of sanctions are based. One of these arguments, and the most important one, is that Israel is guilty of aggression in her recent military action against Egypt. Not for one moment do I believe that such an argument can be legally or morally justified and substantiated.

The second reason why I am opposed to sanctions against Israel is that sanctions constitutes a method of force which, generally speaking, should be instituted by the so-called injured nation. There is a question in this case just which nation is the injured one. The use of force in the settlement of international disputes by the sovereign nations is contrary to the long-established policy of the Government of the United States and certainly the use of force, regardless of the way in which it is used, is not the kind of an atmosphere or the type of foundation upon which permanent peace can be constructed.

The third reason why I am unalterably opposed to the use of sanctions is that the employment of sanctions never has been and never will be of any importance or effect when used against a large, powerful country. For example, any attempt, either by the United Nations or the United States, separately, or as a part of the United Nations, to employ sanctions against Russia for its invasion of Hungary would not only be totally ineffective but would be ludicrous and a complete failure. Against a small, weak nation, however, namely Israel, the

employment of sanctions by the United States in conjunction with the United Nations would be effective, causing the result of great suffering on the part of the people of Israel.

I do not believe permanent peace can come to the Middle East, or a solution to the existing problems in the Middle East can be achieved by any rule of force which might be effective against a small nation and ineffective against a large nation. From the viewpoint of respect for the Government of the United States throughout the world and from the viewpoint of our desire for international peace of a permanent nature, sanctions, if employed, would result in serious damage to both our respect and our permanent peace. You cannot have one rule which applies to the strong nations and another rule which applies to the weak nations.

In this crisis it appears to me some faulty thinking has been taking place without a fundamental and exacting analysis of all of the factors involved. Israel has been branded an aggressor. Now this word "aggressor" is another one of these legal terms many persons associated with international diplomacy and affairs toss around rather recklessly. In some cases it has a certain meaning. In other cases it has a different meaning. In still other situations, other interpretations are given within its concept. In this controversy between Israel and Egypt there has not been any thorough application of thought so far as this term "aggression" is concerned. Just because a nation happens to strike the first blow in a military action does not make a nation an aggressor. A sovereign nation has the duty to protect and defend its life. The government of a sovereign nation has the duty to take whatever steps are necessary to protect its nation from being destroyed.

If it is the stated intention of a nation to destroy its neighbor, and certainly that was the assertion and intention of Egypt against Israel, and if the nation determined to destroy the other one takes positive steps to do so, then certainly the nation that is threatened has the right to act in its own self-defense. In the present crisis, Israel was the threatened nation and Israel had a duty to take whatever steps were necessary to defend itself against the prevailing threat.

There has been considerable loose talk on the part of statesmen, both in and out of the United Nations, regarding the question of international morality in this current crisis. So-called statesmen have concluded that it is an act of national immorality to fire the first shot. Such a conclusion is against commonsense, patriotism, the right to defend oneself, and the right to prevent being destroyed. The issue involved is not whether or not firing the first shot constitutes a moral or an immoral act. The issue involved is whether or not a sovereign nation has the duty and the right to protect itself from destruction.

In this current crisis between Israel and Egypt, certainly Israel had every right to take the action which it did take. If any nation on the face of this earth,

or any group of nations, threatened the United States of America with destruction, I hope the United States would not wait for the fatal blow to be made. I hope my country would move and move quickly to prevent that fatal blow from ever being struck. In this way my country not only would save itself but it would save injury and destruction to millions of American people. In the same way and in the same concept, the little nation of Israel was faced with the job of preventing that fatal blow from being struck by the military forces of Nasser's Egypt. In view of this fact, Israel is not an aggressor and it is wrong for the United States of America to even consider such a premise.

For the purpose of protecting its sovereignty, in fact, for the purpose of its survival, Israel has asked the United Nations as well as the United States for certain guaranties that the aggressive atrocities and the violations of its sovereignty on the part of Egypt be prevented in the future. The guaranties Israel has requested are not unreasonable. They are, in fact, worthy of honor. Just because Israel is a small, comparatively defenseless nation is no reason why it should be subjected to wrongs by any other nation. The guaranties Israel has requested should be given. Any reasonable solution of the problem of guaranties certainly will be considered by the State of Israel. Only one important matter has to be made certain. It is this. Any guaranties that are given to Israel must be dependable, they must be enforced.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thoroughly agree with the gentlewoman from Massachusetts. I would like to point out too that when these topics were discussed there was no publicity. We have a serious role insofar as the United Nations is concerned, and we should exercise it to secure the peace.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I agree with the gentleman from California.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to my colleague from Massachusetts.

Mr. LANE. Like so many of your colleagues here on the floor of the House I too wish to commend the gentleman from California for bringing this to the attention of the House today. I wish also to commend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BOYLE].

This debate is long overdue. Since I had an opportunity of making a statement here on the floor in reference to the same subject matter earlier today I do not desire to encroach upon the gentleman's valuable time now except to say that the gentleman is to be complimented and congratulated for his very sincere, thoughtful, and worthwhile statement here this afternoon, and I too wish to join with the other Members of Congress in vigorous opposition to the imposition of any sanctions against Israel. This is a subject matter that should be of vital interest to every citizen of the whole United States at this crucial time.

I congratulate the learned gentleman on his excellent statement and his timely action in bringing this matter to the attention not only of the people of our country but also of all nations of the world.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I am very grateful to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate my colleague on a very fine exposition of a very difficult subject. I think what he has done today is not only a credit to himself but to his State and to the Congress. I would like also to join my colleague in his statements. I think he and I feel exactly alike on this subject.

I find, Mr. Speaker, that the American people pride themselves on a traditional sense of fair play. What we are witnessing is not only typical but I might say even commendable to the American people. Today we are witnessing this sense of fair play being flouted by Mr. Nasser and the Arabs, and I am afraid disregarded by our own Secretary of State. The subject of the administration's Near East foreign policy I discussed in my remarks in the RECORD on last Thursday. I was very critical of the President and of the statement which he made on this subject. I said at that time that I would join with my colleagues today in discussing what I thought might be an intelligent approach to this overall problem, and I think it has been set forth very well by my good friend and colleague—the gentleman from California.

I would like to join my colleague in saying that the United States should and must seize the initiative in the United Nations. The United States has been projected by history into a place of leadership in the world, and up until very recently used that position not merely for the good of the United States but also for the good of the people of the world and for world peace. Lately we have reached the point where we see that prestige and leadership endangered by an Arab dictatorship under Nasser pressing this matter of sanctions and trying to set forth what will be American foreign policy. Imagine that. The principal aggressor in the area determines what will be the policy of the U. N. and of the world. At this very hour the question of sanctions against Israel is being discussed, if you will, by the very people who are responsible for the trouble in that area. These sanctions will be applied not by the Arabs, because they have continuously applied sanctions and kept up a state of war by blockade and border warfare against Israel since the 1948 armistice. This has all been in direct defiance of the terms of the armistice and the will of the United Nations.

I think the will of the people of these United States should be recognized. Their will is that no sanctions be applied to the small and weak like Israel while the big aggressors like Russia and India stand with bloody hands arguing such sanctions.

The real solution to the trouble in the Mid-East can only come by approaching

this problem realizing that there are a multitude of conflicts to be considered. The first is that international aspects of right and justice demand that there be free access to the Suez and to the Gulf of Aqaba by all the nations of the world. This Mr. Nasser has flouted, is flouting, and will continue to do so until stopped. Even now he is stalling the clearing of the Suez Canal.

We can approach the problems of the area together, including the internationalization of the Gaza Strip, which is a long trouble area. We can offer a new guaranty to all the nations of that area that their borders will be protected by an adequate United Nations police force so that no one needs to fear strife and border raids. Incidentally, there have been 15 or 20 border raids into Israel during the last 2 weeks, while Nasser has been talking about Israeli aggression. We can use the \$200 million aid in the Middle East resolution on which we voted recently not to make richer the already wealthy Arab dictators, but to really solve the basic economic problems of the area. Some of this money can be used to help develop the Jordan River Valley and the Nile River Valley for the benefit of all the states in the area. It can help resettle refugees. Now is not the time to develop Mr. Nasser's Nile, when he is again buying Communist arms, as he is doing for the third, fourth, or fifth time in recent history.

I submit that this is the intelligent program. This will serve not only the interests of the United States, but, very frankly, the interests of the world. It will do something to solve the problems of that area, not to continue them unabated as they have been by merely destroying the status quo, as apparently it is the intention of the administration.

I would like to commend the gentleman and my other friends on the floor who have thrown some light on a subject which is very important and very near and dear to the hearts of all of us.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. I thank the gentleman from California.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that it is a very wholesome thing that certain Members, and particularly the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT], have arranged an opportunity for a discussion by representatives of the people of the United States in what might be called a national forum on the Israeli-Arab problem, and in particular, of course, the proposed sanctions against Israel. If partisan viewpoints influence the objectivity of our discussion, it could be unfortunate. Certainly we recognize that President Eisenhower is following his conscience. As for me I have never changed my position, namely that I have actively urged our representative in the United Nations, Mr. Lodge, to do everything in his power to see that Israel is given full guaranties as far as withdrawing from the Strait of Aqaba and likewise, of course, the Gaza Strip. United Nations troops should immediately be stationed at Sharm-el-Sheik to



keep the Gulf of Aqaba open to Israel before any evacuation of Israeli forces.

I have constantly pointed out the inconsistency of invoking sanctions against one small nation when the United Nations failed to act in similar cases. Unfortunately I am at this moment supposed to be at a committee meeting and therefore it is impossible for me to elaborate in any detail. But I do think the Arab-Israeli problem is closer to the hearts of the American people at the present time than any other problem. I believe that the majority of the Members of this House sense this. In particular I believe that the American people are against active sanctions, and favor a sort of compromise operation whereby Israel is given full protection as she withdraws.

At this very moment further talks between Abba Eban, the Ambassador of Israel, and Mr. Dulles are probably in progress. I hope what is said here will help and not hurt an agreement. Let us hope a satisfactory arrangement is concluded.

Let me repeat there is a great danger, it seems to me, in injecting partisan politics into this issue. I felt so gratified that our former colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina, Mr. Richards, was selected by the President as a sort of roving ambassador to help work out the Middle East problem. The United States under the leadership of our President I am sure when history is written will always be proud that it stood up for a policy of peaceful settlements of all national disputes. Now I feel that our second step is to continue our proper course and to insist that a just peace be consummated. We cannot compromise on that. We are morally bound to uphold the integrity of Israel, and the Arabs have been unwilling to sit down and discuss peace. Once peace is achieved the entire area can start trading and developing its resources and thus build a higher standard of living for its people. Meanwhile in struggling with this problem let us never overlook that Israel is much like America was when our Founding Fathers were debating the problems of that day. Solutions for the establishment of a just peace in the same way is what Israel is seeking today.

I thank the gentleman for yielding briefly to me so I could rather inadequately express my views, which nevertheless are heartfelt.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thank the gentleman for his very able contribution.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SISK. I thank the gentleman for yielding. Certainly I, too, wish to commend him for taking this time today and for entering into what I believe to be one of the most important discussions we in this country can indulge in at the present time. I am concerned about peace in the Middle East also. I think all of us, as Members of Congress, and I think all of the people in America, are concerned with resolving the difficulties with which we are faced. It is my firm conviction that the people of this country are much

concerned about any attempt to use pressure or to bring sanctions against the nation of Israel. Certainly, Israel in that area of the world represents in a large measure, I believe, the position that we held some 150 years ago in this area of the world.

I would like at this moment, because I think it is important, to discuss this matter of sanctions. As I understand, at this very moment, the resolution proposed by the Arabian countries is before the United Nations for discussion as to whether or not sanctions will be voted against Israel. I would like to ask my colleague from California just what in his opinion he feels would be the impression upon the many small countries in the world of friendship toward the United States if we go along and vote with the bloc for sanctions against Israel. I think that it is important for many reasons, because certainly if we become a party to bringing pressure to bear upon Israel, pressure that could bring Israel to her knees and actually destroy her as a nation, what, in the gentleman's opinion, would be the effect on our standing with many of the other nations of the world? Would the gentleman comment on that, because I know he has given a great deal of study to this subject. I think that he has had an opportunity to visit some of these areas. I certainly am not an expert on foreign affairs, although I will say right here that as I look around and see some of the things that are occurring I wonder if we have any experts on foreign affairs. I would like to have the gentleman's comment on what he feels might happen so far as our friendship with other countries in the world is concerned if we did join in sanctions.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I will say to the gentleman that I think we would be helping in setting a very dangerous precedent. As you know, it would establish once and for all, I think, that we were willing to impose sanctions where we felt that they could not be resisted because of the weakness of the individual nation against whom the sanctions were to be placed. And, it would give encouragement, in my humble opinion, to more aggressive action by the Soviet bloc and it would encourage our Communist opponents to make certain that wherever they wanted they could exercise pressure, and they would feel they had moral justification, which we would in some way have provided to them for the kind of action which we had under consideration. And, I think in the long run, it would mean that the small nations which are growing up in Asia and starting now to grow up in Africa would have a sense of insecurity unless they could join a powerful bloc and that their only hope would be in the protection of a power, one side or the other of an argument, and they would tend to lose not only their respect for us, because they could not help but feel we had sacrificed friendship for expediency, but it would tend to divide the world into two great power blocs, which is exactly what we have been trying to get away from through the work of the United Nations.

Mr. SISK. I want to say that I agree completely with the gentleman. He, as I understand his statement, agrees with me that by taking that action we are going along and, in fact, sanctioning a double standard for nations; is that correct?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. SISK. And in the sanctioning of a double standard for nations, then actually is it not a fact that the many small countries of the world who are attempting to get along and to maintain their independence and to copy American democracy would receive a very grave blow from the standpoint of their morale if they felt that we, after all, as the leader of the free world, turned our back upon the great precept that we have used down through the years of our history? These are some of the things that I think are so important. And although I have the kindest feeling for our Ambassador to the United Nations, Henry Cabot Lodge, for our Secretary of State, and for the President, and appreciation of the task they have in the determination of these very grave problems, because they are faced with tremendous burdens, yet I would hope that they might be able to see their way clear to pursue a course which would not place us in that position.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I want simply to thank the gentleman from California [Mr. Sisk] and say that I think what he has made clear is that we should not be a part of building a greater system of satellite nations. We should be standing behind a system of free, independent nations.

Mr. SISK. Exactly.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield to my friend from Illinois, Mr. YATES.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I should like to commend the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] for the very excellent statement that he has made, and for the very comprehensive analysis that he has given to the House on the extremely complicated situation in the Middle East.

I voted against the President's Middle East resolution when it was before the House a few weeks ago, not without some trepidation, because one does not easily vote against our President when he asks for approval of a certain policy he intends to espouse in the field of foreign affairs. It is his primary responsibility to formulate our relationships throughout the world and ordinarily, in the absence of the most cogent reasons, one does not reject his recommendations.

Nevertheless, because I had so many qualms about the direction which American foreign policy has taken in recent years, because of the profound lack of information furnished the Congress by Mr. Dulles, because of the total failure of the doctrine to attempt to come to grips with any of the vital problems which are fomenting strife in the Middle East, because of many reasons, I decided to vote against the resolution. Subsequent events in the Middle East, and the debate on the resolution in the other body, have sustained my conviction that my vote was the correct one.

This morning's newspaper showed a picture of King Saud seated with other members of the Arab bloc. The caption under the picture said that King Saud was explaining the so-called Eisenhower doctrine to other members of the Arab bloc. If this be true, King Saud is in a much more fortunate position than Members of Congress because none of them have been told how the Eisenhower doctrine is supposed to operate. Perhaps the \$100 million which has been promised to King Saud, according to the report which appeared in the papers last week, had something to do with his approval of the doctrine. It seems to me, however, that the speech made by the junior Senator from Montana in the other body last week expressed the impression which most Members of Congress have of the doctrine, namely, that it is an empty declaration devoid of policy.

The President's Middle East resolution was brought to the Congress in an atmosphere in which a sense of urgency was sought to be imparted. It had to be passed quickly and unanimously—as unanimously as possible, if it was to have the desired effect, which was to show to the world that the President and Congress were united behind the Eisenhower doctrine. The President wanted Congress to stand with him. He showed a respect for the opinions and action of Congress in urging its Members to enact, as promptly as possible, the resolution embodying his Mid-East doctrine.

Is it not exceedingly strange therefore, that we now find the profound reluctance on the part of the President to accept congressional opinion in opposition to the imposition of sanctions upon Israel? The majority and minority leaders of both Houses of Congress have made known to the President their opposition to such sanctions. Two of the Members of Congress who are now a part of our delegation to the United Nations have publicly declared that they will resign from the delegation if sanctions are voted by the United States against Israel. Opposition to such sanctions has been expressed by many Members of both Houses. There are only a few, fewer, I would say, than voted in opposition to the Eisenhower resolution, who would vote to sustain the President's viewpoint in demanding sanctions against Israel. And yet the President insists on pursuing his course stubbornly. And so I ask the gentleman from California, would he not believe that the President, in the same spirit which induced him to request congressional approval for his Mid-East resolution, would accept the congressional viewpoint in opposition to placing sanctions upon Israel?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I would agree with the gentleman. Of course, I recognize that in matters of foreign policy it is the responsibility of the executive branch and the President and the Secretary of State in particular to lead and to formulate and to carry into action our foreign policy; but it would seem to me only logical that if he feels that he needs to be advised on certain parts of his foreign policy it would be only proper to come and make sure that he

has our agreement on the rest of the foreign policy. That very argument is one of the reasons I am delighted that so many from both sides of the aisle have taken the opportunity to inform the Executive of our feeling today, and I hope that others will in the future, in order that he can be sure that he does not have agreement with regard to the present seeming policy toward the Middle East.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman. I want again to express my approval of the statements he has made and to join with him in the hope that the executive branch will not see fit to impose sanctions on the one bastion of democracy in the Middle East.

Much has been said about the double standard and the incongruous position in which the President's insistence upon sanctions against Israel would place our country; namely, that of having one standard for powerful nations such as Communist Russia, and another for tiny, weak nations such as Israel. Apparently, the President is willing to apply the same double standard in his relations with Congress. On one hand he asks congressional approval of his statement of policy for the Middle East. On the other hand, he is unwilling to accept congressional disapproval of his standard toward placing sanctions against Israel. Such a piecemeal approach to the highly complex Middle East situation rather than promulgating a total constructive program, must inevitably result in failure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLLAND). The gentleman from California has consumed 1 hour.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California be permitted to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to commend the gentleman upon his statement. I think the American people are opposed to double standards of international morality. In my opinion the people of this country do not want to see the United Nations impose sanctions upon Israel. In my judgment, if the United States voted for sanctions in the United Nations, it would seriously divide our people on an issue on which they should be united.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the RECORD immediately following the remarks of the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to commend the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT], in his criticism of our Government's position in pressing upon the United Nations the exercise of sanctions against the Israeli nation. The ostensible purpose of these sanctions is to compel Israel to relinquish the Gaza Strip and the Straits of Tiran without any

assurance that it will be able to engage in free and unrestrained commerce through the Gulf of Aqaba.

The imposition of sanctions presupposes that Israeli occupation constitutes an act of aggression against Egypt and also presupposes that the prohibition by Egypt of Israeli use of the Suez and the Gulf of Aqaba does not. The restraint upon Israeli commerce in the use of international waterways is as much an act of aggression as actual invasion. For practical purposes the Egyptian disregard of the rights of a sister nation to engage in free and unrestrained international commerce is as harmful to the nation of Israel as the use of gunfire.

The Israeli Government has made clear that its holding of these disputed areas is only for the preservation of its rights to peaceful commerce. It has been made abundantly clear that the occupation is not designed for permanent acquisition or for self-aggrandizement. The willingness of the Israelis to evacuate for United Nations occupation is a clear and positive refutation of its own claim to territorial occupation.

In a sense the Israeli Government has indicated its willingness to interplead or leave to the determination of the United Nations the occupation of the disputed areas until the steps toward permanent settlement can be established. The Egyptian-Israeli controversy cannot be settled in any other way.

To compel one of the disputants to the controversy to relinquish its tactical advantage without review and careful analysis of the causes of the dispute results in arbitrary action. To this point in the Middle East conflict the Egyptian Government has given every assurance that it will not change its position or attitude toward its nationalization of the Suez or to its power to determine who shall have the right to use the Suez for commercial purposes. Nor has it conceded the right of the Israelis to use the Gulf of Aqaba and its seaports thereon in an unrestrained manner.

In the face of a prohibition on the use of the Suez and the prospect of armed resistance to its use of the Gulf of Aqaba, the tiny nation of Israel, with all its great enterprise and promise, is assured of a dismal future indeed. Without freedom to develop its own enterprise through the use of international commerce, the Israeli nation faces the prospect of early atrophy.

The struggle of the Israeli nation to take its place among the nations of the world has been rewarded with phenomenal success. As a matter of fact, the success and the development of this nation has posed a most serious threat to the retarded development of adjoining nations. In this area, competition has been wholesome and to the good. It is indeed regrettable that national envy has forced Egypt to deny to Israel the right to continue its very fruitful development.

It is indeed deplorable that American diplomatic policy has forced the United Nations to this position in its anxiety to court favor with a recalcitrant Egypt—a



nation which has made clear in no uncertain terms its intentions to continue in a course of conduct which precipitated a dangerous international conflict. The imposition of sanctions by the United Nations upon Egypt is not a course toward peace. On the contrary, it is a course toward war. It is an offering to an ambitious dictator whose position and continuance in office depends on the forcefulness of his demands upon free world governments. His appetite for concessions for himself and sanctions against his enemies is insatiable.

The Secretary of State seems to have an uncanny ability of separating this Nation from its friends in this shrinking world.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, I would not want the occasion to pass without taking this opportunity of congratulating the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] for the very fine and forthright statement he has made on this very serious problem. I will not delay the deliberations other than to make some brief comments.

First, I would like to say to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] that I am sure the majority of Americans join with him in expressing the sentiment that the United States is taking the wrong attitude when we talk about imposing sanctions against Israel. The clouds over Israel are dark and heavy. I believe conditions will be worse instead of better if sanctions are imposed on that country. So I say to the gentleman that I hope his forthright advice made in this House today is heeded, and I hope that those people who are guiding the affairs of the United States in the United Nations will give some serious thought to the proposals made today. I reiterate that I predict that conditions will become much worse instead of better if sanctions are imposed.

I want to congratulate the gentleman. He has made a wonderful statement today, as he always does when he takes the floor. I thank him for his statement and agree with everything he has had to say on this very important subject. I am sorry that more Members were not present to hear his enlightening and eloquent statement.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] has expired.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, in the past week the Israeli-Egyptian conflict has reached a new stage of crisis. The United Nations called for the withdrawal of Israeli forces from the Gaza Strip and Sharm el Sheikh, the strategically important area along the Gulf of Aqaba. This Israel refused to do until it had ironclad guaranties that both areas would not be used by Egypt to stage future attacks. Pending in the United Nations General Assembly is a resolution calling for sanctions against Israel.

At first our Government had not entirely clarified its position on the issue of sanctions. It apparently took the position that some pressure ought to be

exerted by the United Nations upon Israel. On February 26, however, the press reported that the Government was prepared to submit a resolution to the General Assembly which would call for the United Nations control of the Gaza and Aqaba areas but would omit any mention of sanctions.

In many respects the initial position taken by our Government was somewhat precipitate. No doubt it had reasons for this action; but the issue at stake goes far beyond the question of Israeli-American relations: It vitally concerns our relations with the entire Middle East.

In this complex of international politics our guide should be to seek justice and accomplish the objectives of our policy interests. The question is, Can justice and our enlightened self-interest be achieved by imposing sanctions on Israel? I think not. I welcome, therefore, the change of mood in our Government on this question. More than any other nation, Israel depends upon the United States for its economic sustenance. Were we to cut off all economic ties with Israel, that small democratic nation would be perceptibly weakened and clearly placed in an indefensible position. Certainly a course of action which would bring about such results would not be just. Nor would our best interests be served. Egypt is not without guilt in this present crisis. Indeed, it was the uncompromising hatred that Egypt so often voiced for Israel and the continued Egyptian threats to eradicate Israel from the face of the globe that was the root cause of the crisis. And while America would not wish to reward Israel for her action, certainly it would not want to whet the Arab appetite for conquest by a move which would inevitably invite an attack on an economically weakened Israel.

The solution to this highly complex problem is difficult. The world has had this seemingly insoluble problem for over a decade, and the prospects are still not bright for reaching a reasonable agreement. However, sanctions against Israel are not the answer. A just solution would seem to require concrete guaranties to Israel that once withdrawal from the disputed areas was effected, Egypt would not use them to stage attacks on Israeli territory and shipping.

In addition, every effort should be made to persuade Egypt to permit the final clearing of the Suez Canal and to accept a form of control of the canal that would be consistent with both Egyptian national interests and the interests of the other nations of the world which look upon the canal as a vital waterway. Once success has been achieved in these matters all energies should then be directed toward building a broader Arab-Israeli understanding.

America has entered the Middle Eastern political arena in full force. Let our force, both physical and moral, continue to be applied to serve the ends of justice, as well as our own enlightened national interest, constructively at all times. Sanctions, gentlemen, are neither constructive nor do they serve our interests.

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, let me congratulate the Representative from California for the eloquence and clarity with which he has spoken this afternoon. He has presented forcefully the facts in this complex situation and he has made constructive and feasible recommendations. I fully concur with his position on this crucial issue.

I expressed to the House on February 11 my strong opposition to both political and economic sanctions against Israel. Sanctions cannot be justified on any grounds. The problem is one of self-preservation and survival for Israel, and we have no right to place demands on her alone. A constituent aptly expressed it in the following: "A beagle with a stuffed nose cannot flush quail."

Yesterday the prayer in the House was offered by Rabbi Alan M. Sokobin, Temple Beth El, Laurelton, Long Island, who is the son of my esteemed friend, Mr. Max Sokobin. I was impressed with Rabbi Sokobin's words:

May this House, in its deliberations, never sacrifice human rights to political expediency.

May principles, not expediency, guide our Government and the U. N. in this difficult hour and may the double standard of morality be repudiated. It is my earnest prayer that our Government will exert leadership in reaching a just settlement that will rightfully preserve the freedom and integrity of Israel.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND], who is now in the chair as Speaker pro tempore, be permitted to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, I feel highly honored that Speaker RAYBURN asked me to preside during the debate on Israel today. The presentation of the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT], and the presentation of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BOYLE], were very instructive. I feel sure that many of my colleagues who entered into the debate were instrumental in bringing into the open the true story of what may go down into history as Israel's betrayal.

Not many years ago, a man by the name of Hitler was made a power in the world by appeasement. I am sure that all of you remember Neville Chamberlain, the man with the umbrella, and his appeasement policy. Mr. Chamberlain granted Hitler many concessions despite the fact that many voices were raised here in America pointing out the appeasement of Hitler could only result in war. There were others who claimed that concessions made by Chamberlain meant there would be no war in our lifetime. I personally feel that this one act of Neville Chamberlain's was the primary cause of World War II with the resulting death and suffering to many millions of people.

Today we are being challenged by another dictator, Nasser of Egypt, who is fast becoming a hero in the eyes of the

Arab world because he is getting concession after concession with the apparent backing of our State Department.

Have we in America forgotten that at one time our country was also a small nation attempting to establish a true democracy just like Israel is trying to do today? Here is an outpost in the most troubled part of the world where a little nation has established a government of freedom and whose progress in the short time of its existence might be called miraculous.

Here is a country which has brought modern know-how to a backward area and which has practically cultivated the desert sands and made them give the necessities of life. Here is a country in which hospitals have been built to administer to the Arabs—where they have been cured of disease which would have taken many Arab lives. Here is a nation where millions of Americans of both Jewish and Christian faiths have donated money to build an outpost of real civilization.

I could go on and on enumerating the contributions Israel has made to that part of the world. She has demonstrated that free people can build a nation of freedom and of progress. It could be that dictators of backward countries are afraid their subjects will somehow discover what it means to have the freedom which Israel offers.

I believe this debate has brought very clearly to the American people the sad realization that the policy of our State Department is not the policy of a friend or a brother. Neither is it that of a kindred spirit, but more on the order of a brutal bully, willing to sacrifice this small nation to gain the good will of Dictator Nasser.

I realize that oil plays an important part in some of the decisions which have been made, but I hope we are not going to revert to a policy that considers money or profits before the welfare of free people. Surely the United States is not going to tell other small nations of the world they are too little or too unimportant to consider. How are we going to appeal to oppressed people if we appease the oppressors? Has the principle of big business so permeated the thinking of this administration that they only want to play with the strong at the expense of the weak?

Mr. Speaker, I hope and pray that this is not the case. I hope that the President of the United States who is morally responsible for our foreign policy will not become known as the Neville Chamberlain of his day by appeasing Dictator Nasser at the expense of our friend, little Israel. The people of Israel have suffered much at the hands of the Arabs. Hundreds have been killed while tilling the soil. Rifles must be kept handy at all times.

Israel today is engaged in the same sort of struggle waged by the Founding Fathers of America in their fight for survival against the Indians. The fate of Israel and its right to exist among the free nations of the world lies largely in the hands of the President of the United States. I hope he shall rise to the occasion.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the core of this problem for our country lies not in the Middle East but here in the United States. We can make a real contribution only if we face the problem here—and this is a responsibility and a challenge which the administration and Congress must face up to.

Just a little over a year ago—on February 7, 1956—many of us who are here today participated in a lengthy debate on this same matter. I recall saying on that occasion that “we must face the fact that the realities of the situation in the Near East are not what they were a year ago. Soviet influence is now firmly established in Egypt and in other areas of the Middle East.” Many Members of this body joined in pointing out not only the clear-cut danger of Soviet influence in this area but also the dangers surrounding the rising tensions between Israel and the Arab States.

In the 12 months which have elapsed since that time, Mr. Speaker, the administration has faced up to only one of these critically dangerous problems. There is no question but that the recently announced Eisenhower doctrine recognizes the disastrous consequences which will follow the further establishment of Soviet influence in the Middle East. Tragically late though it may be, I believe that this doctrine will offer some hope of halting the covert Soviet aggression which has as its aim the paralysis of the economies of our best allies.

But surely we are all aware that the Eisenhower doctrine offers no United States leadership for the solution of the hostility between Israel and the neighboring Arab States. Our efforts appear to be directed to perpetuating the shadowy policy of “impartial friendship” which long since has lost us the respect of Arabs and Israelis alike.

Actually, of course, there is nothing impartial about our policy in the Middle East. We are all too ready to relegate the fate of Israel to the United Nations, and at the same time to use every means possible to pressure this isolated outpost of democracy into the totally indefensible position in which it has found itself for nearly 5 years.

We are quick to brand Israel's military action into the Sinai Peninsula as aggression, but we steadfastly refuse to consider the Egyptian acts which inspired this move as anything akin to aggression.

President Eisenhower is very impressive when he states that under no circumstances can Israel, as an aggressor, lay down conditions for her withdrawal from the Gaza Strip and the Gulf of Aqaba, but the fact of the matter is that for months prior to this pronouncement, the United States has done everything possible to negotiate with Israel the conditions of her withdrawal.

Clearly, Mr. Speaker, we recognize the indefensibility of requiring Israel to re-

sume the position of extreme vulnerability which could only result from returning to the status quo of last year and the years leading up to last year. Surely we must recognize, if we are to be honest, that the United Nations has failed to provide Israel with that minimum degree of security which the integrity of any democratic nation demands.

It is for this reason, Mr. Speaker, that I concur with the sentiments expressed by my colleagues and that I exhort this administration to devote its great potential leadership, both within the United States and outside, to the immediate problem of protecting the basic rights and guaranteeing the security of Israel and the other Middle Eastern nations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLLAND). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BOYLE] for 60 minutes, under a special order heretofore entered.

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] for his fine presentation. I want to adopt by reference and incorporate in my speech those observations he has made.

For some 3 hours I have noted that the great chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON], has been sitting in the Chamber. I know there are few greater liberals in the world than that great chairman of the Committee on Government Operations. I know that he has many and varied demands on his time. Out of deference to his tight schedule I am very happy, if Mr. DAWSON desires at this time, to yield such time to him as he may need to talk about this highly critical subject.

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BOYLE] for his courtesy. I am not prepared at this time to carry on. I came to listen to my colleagues [Mr. ROOSEVELT and Mr. BOYLE] and others who spoke on this subject matter. I am in agreement with all that I have heard.

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, from what you have already heard on the floor today and what you have read in the newspapers and seen over the television and heard over the radio for some months, it is not hard for you to grant that the situation in the Middle East poses one of the most challenging problems that has come across the international scene in generations.

Today the fate of Israel, yes, probably the fate of the United Nations, the fate maybe even of democratic processes in the world scheme, are at stake; and since the attention of the world has been so riveted on this problem maybe we ought to go back in retrospect just a little bit to better understand some of the physical facts that gave rise to this situation.

The giant oil companies with their billions of dollars at stake have indulged in a program of advertising, public relations, and brainwashing to the extent that it is almost a proved and established premise in this occult syllogism that Israel is an unjust aggressor in this whole picture and should be dealt with



summarily. Having accepted that premise, of course, you never go into or approach the more necessary question of "unclean hands"; you never resolve the question of self-defense. Through the centuries of civilization the history of every nation has recorded the fact that self-defense was one of the most noble and one of the most moral occupations and assignments of free people. If you will recall the current history, the short history of Israel, you find through 9 long years she has been challenged repeatedly for her very existence, and the challenge has been no isolated or ill-thought-out boast; no, it has been repeated and reiterated so often that you can scarcely blame any nation for taking upon itself the titanic effort of defending itself against the aggression of her avowed and mortal enemy. That probably is the fact that provoked Abba Eban, Israel's Ambassador to the United States, and head of the delegation to the United Nations, to observe and point out to the United Nations General Assembly on November 1, 1956, the historical background. I quote his statement:

Stretching back far behind the events of this week lies the unique and somber story of a small people subjected throughout all the years of its national existence to a furious, implacable, comprehensive campaign of hatred and siege for which there is no parallel or precedent in the modern history of nations. Not for one single moment throughout the entire period of its modern national existence has Israel enjoyed that minimal physical security which the United Nations Charter confers on all member states and which all other member states have been able to command.

Israel is a beleaguered state. Its 8,000 square miles of territory—about the size of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts—are wedged between the Mediterranean Sea and hostile Arab nations. From the time of the United Nations General Assembly's resolution calling for the partition of Palestine—November 29, 1947—Arab guerilla bands and then armies from the adjacent Arab States carried on full-scale war against the Zionists, determined to destroy the new state. For nearly a year the new Republic of Israel fought for its very existence against overwhelming odds, fought and put to rout the Arab armies with the exception of Jordan's Arab Legion in the Jerusalem area. Under auspices of the United Nations, armistices were concluded between Israel and the neighboring Arab States. The first of these was signed on February 24, 1949, almost exactly 8 years ago, between Israel and Egypt. Subsequent arrangements were made between Israel and Syria, Lebanon and Jordan.

These armistice agreements were to be the first step toward the conclusion of genuine peace treaties between Israel and the Arab States. In reality, they only exchanged one form of warfare for another: full-scale military action for border raids, guerilla attacks, economic boycotts and blockades, all of these underscored by the unremitting hostility of the Arab States toward Israel and their often-repeated avowal to exterminate the Jewish nation. The President of Syria has referred to Israel as a "cancer"

which must be eradicated. Other Arab leaders have spoken of "one Arab nation," vowing to mobilize all Arab strength to destroy Israel.

Such has been the situation for nearly 9 years. The continuing violation of Israel's borders by Arab raiders from Syria, Jordan and Egypt has meant constant vigilance to meet the assaults that have taken such a heavy toll of Israeli life and property. It has meant the diversion of a large measure of Israel's very limited resources to maintain the military strength with which to defend her frontiers. It has meant that new towns and settlements in a land where no point is more than 25 miles from a hostile border must serve as frontier fortresses—must be built in such a way as to provide the most advantageous defense positions rather than to provide for the best utilization of land and other natural resources.

But the constant pillaging and harassment of Israel's frontiers has been only one aspect of the concerted Arab effort to destroy Israel. Since 1948 the Arab States have maintained a consistent economic boycott of Israel. Cut off from natural sources of vital materials and from natural markets for her industrial products, Israel has been compelled to subsist with enormous foreign trade deficits. In 1955, for example, Israel's imports were valued at \$326 million and exports at only \$86 million.

In 1948 the Government of Egypt inaugurated a program of visit, search, and seizure of vessels known to be or suspected of being involved in the transportation of goods to or from Israel. Both ships and cargoes were confiscated in some instances and punitive measures taken against the shipping of various countries desiring to enter into normal commercial relations with Israel. The flags of at least 15 nations, possessing unconditional right of free navigation of the Suez Canal, have been abused by unjustifiable interception—and that by a state which professes to abide by the Suez Canal Convention of 1888. The basis of that Convention is the assurance that "The Suez Maritime Canal shall always be free and open, in time of war as in time of peace, to every vessel of commerce or of war, without distinction of flag." Ships attempting passage through the canal, with Israeli goods among their cargoes, nevertheless have been confiscated and sold, sailors have been imprisoned, and penalties have been imposed on shipping lines known to have touched at Israel's Mediterranean ports. All of this represents an effort to destroy by economic warfare a small nation that could not be crushed by Arab military force.

These restrictions on peaceful international commercial shipping have been applied since 1950 to the Gulf of Aqaba—the approach to the Negev and the new Israeli port of Elath at the head of the gulf—from the Red Sea. On the tip of the Sinai Peninsula and on two tiny, previously uninhabited islands—Tiran and Sinafar—straddling the entrance to the Gulf of Aqaba, Egyptian fortifications—with the collusion of Saudi Arabia—were placed with guns trained across the narrow straits to prevent any ships—of

whatever flag—from reaching the Israeli port of Elath. Although the Egyptian authorities assured the United States that the gun emplacements were not intended to restrict shipping in the gulf, only a handful of ships succeeded in loading or discharging cargoes at the Israeli port prior to November 1956.

These repeated, flagrant violations of international rights of free commerce and navigation for all nations were protested by Israel before the United Nations Security Council. On September 1, 1951 the Security Council called upon Egypt "to terminate the restriction on passage of international commercial shipping and goods through the Suez Canal wherever bound, and to cease all interference with such shipping beyond that essential to the safety of shipping in the canal itself and to the observance of the international conventions in force."

That resolution has been completely disregarded by Egypt. Before the Security Council, Egypt insisted that the armistice agreement signed with Israel did not put an end to a state of war with Israel and would not prevent Egypt from exercising "certain rights of war."

The same attitude of belligerency was repeated in 1954 when Israel again protested to the Security Council that Egypt's continued restrictions on shipping were violations of the armistice agreement and of the Security Council's own resolution. In this instance the resolution calling upon Egypt to permit Israel-bound ships to pass through the Suez Canal and referring the issue of shipping in the Gulf of Aqaba to the Israeli-Egyptian armistice commission was vetoed by the Soviet Union. Thus, in the more than 5 years since the original United Nations resolution was adopted calling for an end to Egypt's interference with free navigation, neither the United Nations nor the major powers, singly or in concert, have found means of securing Egypt's compliance with that resolution. Israel, the target of Egypt's intransigence, has been compelled to distort its trade patterns and expend vast sums needed for other purposes on rerouting its shipping.

This is well illustrated by the situation with respect to oil, as well. Lacking other adequate sources of fuel and power, and believing that its hope of achieving economic viability lies in the development of small industries, Israel is dependent to a considerable extent on petroleum products. Its own oil production, while promising, supplies only a small fraction of the country's needs. Situated geographically near to the vast oil fields of Iraq, Kuwait and Saudi Arabia, and possessing a large, modern refinery at Haifa, Israel would have easy access, under normal conditions, to ample supplies of oil. Yet the oil produced so abundantly from the Middle East fields has been denied to Israel. Not only did Iraq cut the pipeline originally supplying the Haifa refinery from the Mosul area, but neither Saudi Arabia, Kuwait or Bahrain will permit oil concessionaires to divert any production to Israel. Egypt, of course, prohibits the transport of Iranian oil through the Suez Canal to Israel; Lebanon and Syria take pains to prevent any oil reaching their Mediter-

anean ports by pipeline from being shipped to Israel. The latter thus has had no option but to import oil at great expense from the Venezuelan fields—a distance of some 5,000 miles.

Israel's struggle for survival against such overwhelming economic odds has been complicated by moral necessities which have added to the burdens of the new state even as they have enhanced its stature as a symbol of democracy in an area dark with despotism and absolutism.

Those who founded this little republic did so with a strong sense of dedication to a cause—that of providing a haven for displaced and persecuted Jews—not only those who survived Nazi pogroms in Central Europe, but also those whose lives and liberties were endangered in other sectors of the world. The first Israeli Knesset—parliament—in January 1949 promulgated a Law of Return. This was a pledge that Israel would remain a refuge and home for all Jews who might be under pressure to emigrate from any corner of the earth. This was a formal expression of the prime meaning of Israel: to be a haven where persecuted Jews from every land can live in dignity and freedom.

The implementing of this ideal in a small land with few natural resources has created a series of extremely difficult problems. Internal situations in many countries often has borne heavily on Jewish elements where these have been distinguishable from the bulk of the population. In some instances, entire segments of the population were dislodged, finding only in Israel a place of refuge. Thus, at the close of World War II nearly all the Jews of Bulgaria emigrated. The same was true of the greater part of the Jewish community in Yugoslavia and tens of thousands in Czechoslovakia and Poland. Others came from all over the Moslem world from Morocco to Kurdistan—Jews whose forebears had been established in those countries for a thousand years. The Jewish communities of Iraq—125,000—and Yemen—46,000—departed for Israel almost en masse.

This influx threatened to swamp the new state. While adding to the nation's manpower in the army and in the factories, many of the immigrants were destitute, many of them were aged and infirm. In the first 4 years 700,000 immigrants more than doubled the original Jewish population in Israel of 650,000. There are few precedents in history for a population movement of this magnitude. Even though the flight from Palestine of large numbers of Arabs had created some space for Jewish refugees, the immigrant flood created almost insuperable emergencies. In the critical shortage of adequate housing, the newcomers lived in caves, in overcrowded slums and in immigrant tent camps—adding not only to the economic burdens of the young nation, but to its health and educational problems as well. The continuing problems posed by this merging of diverse groups, even of a common religious faith, have affected every aspect of private life and public planning in Israel. They have called for many kinds of sacrifice on the part of the whole population. But they have been met with fortitude, with

courage, with the determination that Israel shall fulfill its destiny as a haven for the oppressed and maintain its rightful, historic place in the community of nations.

This resolution has not faltered even as the forces opposed to Israel's peaceful purpose have been gathering strength and extending their influence. We are all familiar with the course the dictatorship of Egypt has followed in recent years—stirring up hostile emotions in the whole of the Arab world, accepting Soviet bloc armaments which could be intended for one purpose, and one purpose only, defying the United Nations, refusing to consider any peace settlement with Israel.

In a speech on the floor of this House February 8, 1956, I joined in urging that formal treaties be negotiated within the framework of the United Nations guaranteeing the present borders of Israel and that Israel be permitted to buy the \$50 million of arms requested from the United States—a request that has been denied repeatedly. In pointing out the dangerously explosive situation in the Middle East and the prospect of imminent hostilities against Israel I cited four factors as contributing to this tension:

First. Progressively increasing Arab hostility.

Second. Unconditional Soviet support of the Arab position and Soviet penetration of the Middle East, threatening Israel's national existence and its democratic principles of life.

Third. A massive infusion of deathly armaments into Arab countries from both the Communist bloc and the West.

Fourth. The lack of a security alliance with any other nation, causing Israel to feel she stands alone in her peril.

The ensuing course of events only confirmed the correctness of these statements. The pattern of Arab attacks on Israel increased in scope and intensity. Colonel Nasser, the dictator of Egypt, publicly declared his decision to organize a corps of fedayeen—commandos—to fight in Israel under Egyptian direction. Egypt, Syria, and Saudi Arabia solidified their plans for a joint military establishment. The flow of arms from Communist sources continued, leading to the Egyptian boast that "We, and not Israel, shall fix the place and time for the battle."

This, then, is the background to the events of October and November 1956. In the firm belief that a state is entitled to the inherent right of self-defense, the Government of Israel took action to eliminate the source of the constant threat to the lives and property of its citizens and, indeed, to its independent existence. On October 29 Israeli forces advanced into the Sinai Peninsula to eliminate the bases from which fedayeen units had conducted systematic attacks on Israel. On November 2 Israeli forces occupied Gaza and most of the Sinai Peninsula. Within a period of a few days this move had accomplished its aim. It had also uncovered evidence that extensive accumulations of Egyptian arms and supplies had been made with a view to a major invasion of Israel. With the destruction of frontier fortified posts and

the seizure of Egyptian arms depots, Israeli forces evacuated the peninsula, in keeping with the resolutions of the United Nations, with two exceptions. On the Mediterranean front, Israeli forces remained in control of the Gaza Strip, traditionally a part of Palestine, but occupied by Egypt since 1948 and used as a base for forays against Israel, and Israel also retained a hold on the Sharm el Sheikh sector at the mouth of the Gulf of Aqaba, commanding the Strait of Tiran, as insurance that shipping would not again be denied access to the Israeli port of Elath. Israel expressed a willingness to evacuate these positions upon guarantees, first, that Egyptian forces would not be permitted to reoccupy the Gaza Strip so as to resume attacks on Israel; and, second, that an acceptable guaranty be given that Egypt would not again close the Gulf of Aqaba to shipping in Israel's interest. Lacking these assurances, the Israeli Government felt obliged, in the interest of national security, to refuse to accede to the directions of the United Nations or appeals from the United States Government.

The attitude of our own Government in this matter is significant. Very laudably it has been deeply concerned with preserving the peace. Acting in accordance with this view, it had resolutely opposed the military action of Great Britain and France in Egypt, while conceding that the provocation, in Egypt's violation of the Suez Canal Co.'s charter, was very great. Having been, to a large extent, instrumental in securing the withdrawal of British and French forces from Egypt in accordance with United Nations directives, this Government considered the complete withdrawal of Israel from the positions it had occupied to be essential to any attempt to arrive at a solution of Arab-Israel problems. This attitude was reinforced by the measure of approval gained for the United States in the Arab countries and elsewhere in Asia and Africa in consequence of the firm position taken with reference to the action in Egypt by its two principal allies.

The refusal of Israel to withdraw in the absence of guarantees from the two strategic positions on which its future welfare—even survival—to such a large extent depended thus posed a dilemma for the United States. On February 20 President Eisenhower stated that—

We are now . . . faced with a fateful moment as the result of the failure of Israel to withdraw its forces behind the armistice lines, as contemplated by the United Nations resolutions. . . . It insists on firm guarantees as a condition to withdrawing its forces of invasion. This raises a basic question of principle. Should a nation which attacks and occupies foreign territory in the face of United Nations disapproval be allowed to impose conditions on its withdrawal?

His conclusion was that Israel's failure to act in accordance with U. N. direction would do injury to the United Nations, and jeopardize the prospects of peaceful solution of the problems of the Middle East. In short, while admitting that Egypt has in the past violated the armistice agreement and international law, the President implied that Israel should be compelled, by the imposition of sanctions, to withdraw from its remaining



footholds and trust to the United Nations for the security of its vital interests.

How can we justify such a position? How, for example, can we support a vote of sanctions on Israel—sanction which might well accomplish in a few short months the ruin that the Arab States have been unable to achieve in 9 years—when no penalties are imposed on Egypt for its flagrant and far-reaching transgressions? Not only was no action ever directed at Egypt because of noncompliance with United Nations directives regarding the free use of the Suez Canal, but at this very moment Egypt is refusing to permit final clearing of the canal under U. N. auspices and at U. N. expense, thus depriving the world of the use of that waterway in direct violation of the 1888 convention. Yet no steps are being taken or apparently are being contemplated to end that intolerable situation. Leaving out of consideration for the moment the absence of any move to put weight back of the United Nations resolution of November 4, 1956, calling on the Soviet Union to withdraw its forces from Hungary or that of January 24, 1957, charging India with transgressing previous U. N. directives in taking over Kashmir, it is clear that the application of sanctions against Israel alone would amount to a grave injustice.

This view, I may say, is not uniquely my own. It is borne out in authoritative comment from every part of the country. Conceding the technical act of aggression in Israel's armed entry into the Sinai Peninsula, how can that nation be singled out for condign punishment when its very survival as a nation may well depend on the answer to its demand that it be given assurances that its withdrawal from the outposts now held will not result in renewed jeopardy in time to come? How can the policy of advocating that Israel withdraw from its remaining positions and trust to the United Nations for the security of its vital interests alter the factors which have contributed so much, and are contributing so much, to the situation in the Middle East—the increasing Arab hostility, Soviet support of the Arab position and Soviet penetration of the Middle East, the armaments still arriving in Arab States from the Soviet bloc, and Israel's vulnerable position, without alliances, without guarantees, in a hostile world?

I submit that, if the United States proposes to play a major part in the Middle East area, as in other parts of the world, its voice will be heard and its influence will be felt only as its actions are consistent, its policy based on justice and objectivity. Prejudicial action naturally will be applauded by the beneficiary or beneficiaries of the moment, but only an abiding concern for the relative justice of conflicting claims, which means consistency in foreign policy, and the courage to adhere to such policy in the face of short-term influences and interests will make for a lasting peace. You are not going to win the battle of today or the battle of tomorrow or the battle of the future just with sanctions; no, because you are going, by that very oppression to lay the seeds for bigger and more profound hates. We are not going to win the negative way. What we need is not

sanctions. We need settlement. And the first and best way to solve the problem is to look at the matter factually and fairly and try to do complete justice between all of the parties. It is not for a nation or a group of nations having any semblance of respectability or any notion of ethics or morality to pick on the little alleged offenders and leave where it finds them those who are too big or powerful to handle.

It is my hope that this problem will be settled fairly and completely. I am convinced the Gulf of Aqaba problem can be solved by, (1) an Assembly resolution upholding and reiterating what is already in the record—the guarantee of freedom of navigation in the Gulf of Aqaba as well as the Suez Canal; and (2) a firm guarantee that the United Nations Emergency Force be stationed in the area, not as mere "tenants at sufferance" who are there at the convenience, whim, wish, or will of some sheikh or Arab ruler, but with every necessary armament and piece of equipment to completely enforce the armistice. We might as well look at the problem honestly and forthrightly now. If we are ever going to establish the framework for a lasting peace the United Nations force cannot exist there merely at the will of the present dictator of Egypt or of any dictator anywhere.

The problem of the Gaza Strip poses still another real question and in trying to solve it, you have to see the total problem. The question revolves around two alternatives: whether Egypt or the United Nations will take over that territory. If the United Nations does not take over the Gaza Strip, you are not going to have any peace. So whether or not the United Nations has the exclusive or the primary control of the Gaza Strip is not too important, but the United Nations must have at least primary, if not the exclusive jurisdiction and the wherewithal to maintain the peace and order of that area, because every nation in the world and every person in the world has a stake in the problem that is fomenting and festering in the Middle East.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOYLE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman has just touched upon a very important point that should be brought out in connection with this very critical matter. The Gaza Strip, by the original U. N. resolution of 1947 was ceded to what was to become, but never did become a new Arab State. This Gaza Strip was not given to the State of Israel. It was not given to Egypt. It never belonged to Egypt. But when the Arabs attacked Israel in that war of aggression of 1948, Egypt by force of arms captured the Gaza Strip. When the armistice was entered into between Egypt and Israel and the other Arab States in 1949, the Gaza Strip was not given to Egypt, nor was it given to Israel. That agreement, the armistice agreement of 1949, stated that temporary—and I stress the word "temporary"—jurisdiction over the Gaza Strip should be vested by the United Nations in Egypt until there was a determination of the

whole problem and peace treaties were entered into. So when the gentleman points out that what is to be done now is for the United Nations to go in and take back jurisdiction of the Gaza Strip, it is doing exactly what it should do and what it should have done a long time ago. Neither Israel nor Egypt as of now should exercise jurisdiction there. The important thing is to make sure that it is not used as a base for military operations, which will further disturb the peace of the area.

Mr. BOYLE. I thank the gentleman for his very timely observations, as they amplify and supplement my remarks at this point.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOYLE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. In supplementing the fine remarks by the gentleman from New York, it is also not true that if technically the lawyers should rule that Egypt still has technical control under the armistice agreement and that, therefore, the United Nations cannot exercise that control—of course, I do not agree with that, but suppose that that should be the point upon which the technical entrance of the United Nations forces into the Gaza Strip was being held up—would it not then become the duty of the United States to lead inside the United Nations an all-out effort to get from Egypt a resolution that they would give to the United Nations this right until permanent arrangements should be made?

Mr. BOYLE. I think so. I think any time you are able to define and limit areas of dispute between the actual participants you are doing a real service toward compromise and settlement.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Therefore, is it not a fact that it is not of great value for us to be simply harping on what Israel ought to do; we should also begin harping on what Egypt ought to do, if it is Egypt that is blocking the way to this final solution?

Mr. BOYLE. I agree with the gentleman totally, and I want to reiterate the proposition to reasonable people all over the world. The world owes it to itself to see if it can remove itself from the debate on sanctions and talk more and more in terms of settlement.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOYLE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. In furtherance of what the gentleman from California has stated and in supplement of the very able remarks of the gentleman from Illinois, does the gentleman not believe that if Israel were to withdraw its troops from Gaza and from the Straits of Aqaba in accordance with the direction of the United Nations and especially as a result of the insistence of the United States, actually this might result in Egypt's thinking and the other nations of the Middle East thinking that the actions of Egypt which provoked the response by Israel were actually justified, that we were condoning what Egypt had done in provoking the Israeli Government in seeking to do away with the

fedayeen raids and seeking to do away with the raids upon her shipping in entering the Gulf of Aqaba?

Mr. BOYLE. I think that is very true. Again, of course, I think the biggest thing in this whole field today is a positive approach. If we can start today and compose our differences here, we might eliminate the necessity to litigate and relitigate all of those problems that are no longer current. In that case, we would be doing a service not only to Israel, and to Egypt, and that particular area of the world, but we would be assisting the United Nations in her role as the greatest forum ever devised for resolving the collective controversies of civilization.

Mr. YATES. The gentleman is exactly right in that. I should like to recall to the gentleman a fact which I am sure he already knows, and that was the statement by Foreign Minister Moïse Sharett approximately a year ago in pointing out that the Middle East did not consist only of Israel or the Arab nations, it consisted of both of them, of all the nations of the Middle East, and that all of them had to live together and had to find some way of resolving the difficulties that existed.

The difficulties that have existed have been fomented and have been emphasized primarily by the recalcitrants of the Arab nations in refusing to sit down at a conference table and find some modus operandi of getting along with Israel.

Mr. BOYLE. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOYLE. I yield.

Mr. VANIK. Will the gentleman not agree that a parallel to the current situation in the occupation of the Gaza Strip was the situation in Korea, where the United Nations came in and remained in authority until a truce was called? Why not have the same sort of situation prevail in this area: the only pattern we have in our national experience in the Korean situation. Would it not be in keeping with that same pattern to have United Nations come in in this situation and exercise dominion until all of the issues of the conflict have been resolved?

Mr. BOYLE. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOYLE. I yield.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that our distinguished colleague from New Jersey [Mr. ROBINSON] may extend his remarks immediately following the remarks of the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] on this same subject. And I ask unanimous consent that all Members who may desire to do so may extend their remarks on the subject covered in the special orders of the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BOYLE], at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I hope the remarks I have made on the floor today and those of my colleagues have in a small measure pointed up some of the facts that have to be resolved in handling this very difficult problem. I hope that in bringing this to the attention of the Members of the House we have not left the area more clouded than it already is, because I know all of my colleagues and myself have been motivated by the highest of feelings of patriotism, Americanism, and brotherhood.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOYLE. I yield.

Mr. YATES. I would like to congratulate the gentleman from Illinois upon the able delineation of the problems and the possible solution of the difficulties in the Middle East.

Mr. BOYLE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from California for arranging this very important and timely discussion on the floor of the House regarding the very critical and tense Middle East situation. With great relief I noted in this morning's papers that some break in the crisis seems nearer today than was thought possible a few days ago. At least the parties to the dispute are continuing peaceful discussion and negotiation. This, in itself, is a hopeful sign that some solution can be worked out that is both fair and just to all parties involved.

Last week, Mr. Speaker, I was chagrined when the President went before the American people and, to all intents and purposes, called for sanctions against Israel for that nation's refusal to withdraw its forces from Egyptian territory at the mouth of the Gulf of Aqaba and in the Gaza Strip. The President's statement acted as a signal to the Afro-Asian-Arab bloc to move ahead with its resolution demanding sanctions against Israel. This six-nation resolution is now pending before the United Nations General Assembly.

It seems that we have come a long way since the "peace and prosperity" days of the last campaign. Now we are being told that the crisis is so serious that the President needs authority to use American troops in the Middle East and hundreds of millions of dollars must be spent for military and technical aid to the nations of the Middle East. What is more, we are now told that the very future of the United Nations is linked with the Middle East crisis. The key to the President's address last week is found in the statement:

If the United Nations once admits that international disputes can be settled by using force, then we will have destroyed the very foundation of the organization. The United Nations must not fail.

I agree with the President that the United Nations must not fail. It is still our best hope for world peace through the peaceful solution of differences between nations. However, I fail to see why the fate of the U. N. is at stake now when it was not during the time the Soviet Union mowed down 25,000 Hungarian patriots, or while India defies the

U. N. with respect to Kashmir and while Egypt itself ignores her international obligations with respect to the free passage of ships through the Suez Canal. Not the slightest attempt to apply sanctions against these nations for their defiance of the U. N. has been made, but when a small democracy in the Middle East fails promptly to comply with U. N. demands we suddenly become very self-righteous, high principled, and concerned for the future of the United Nations. This administration turns its moral force on and off like a hot water faucet. And it becomes especially moralistic when certain American oil interests are involved.

It seems almost inconceivable to me, Mr. Speaker, that we as a Nation should take a position against a young, thriving democracy in its struggle to stay alive as a nation against almost insurmountable odds. We have traditionally helped the little guy; been on the side of the underdog. We have always helped and nurtured nations whose people share our beliefs in liberty, freedom, human rights, and the dignity of man. Such a nation is Israel.

I have traveled through this country, and I wish all of you sitting here today could have seen and shared with me the experience of watching a young and vital people create out of desert sand a productive and democratic way of life. And always under danger of enemy attack and reprisal raids. The years of torture these people have undergone gives them an incentive to work toward those same goals that caused our own forefathers to revolt against colonial tyranny or escape from bondage into freedom. There they are, surrounded by enemies, looking to us for encouragement. And what do we do? In as sanctimonious a pronouncement that has ever been made in the name of American foreign policy, we turn our backs on a people's fight for survival and excuse our action on the ground that the future of the United Nations is at stake.

Mr. Speaker, is it the United Nations this administration cares about, or is it rather that their real concern is steeped in Middle East oil? In the past 4 years we have bypassed the U. N. at every turn, going back to it only after our own inept policies have so embroiled us in untenable positions throughout the world that our only choice is to throw the entire mess into the lap of the U. N. Then, if something goes wrong, we have someone else to blame. This has been the history of American foreign policy since 1953—a slipshod policy—dodging, drifting, vacillating—which has resulted in consistent loss of prestige, friends, power, and the ability to bring about peace in the world.

Now, trapped by our own errors of judgment and policy, we allow the Arab bloc to back us to the wall in the U. N. and demand sanctions against Israel. Sanctions against Israel are as much the result of our own bungling as they are the result of Israel's refusal to withdraw their troops from Gaza and Aqaba without U. N. guarantees which they seek. It is for this reason that I cannot, in good conscience, agree with the President that the U. N. should apply sanctions



against Israel. That tiny nation should not be made to suffer because of our mistakes and our selfish interests in Middle East oil. If this administration is so concerned with principles, then let it not forget certain principles upon which this Nation's greatness is built: fair play, justice, equal treatment to all, big and small alike.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ALLEN of California for the period from February 28 to March 19, 1957, inclusive, on account of official business.

Mr. MAILLIARD from February 28 to March 19, on account of official business.

Mr. JACKSON for 30 days for active duty in the United States Marine Corps Reserve and study mission for Committee on Foreign Affairs in the Near and Middle East.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. BAILEY, for 30 minutes, on Monday next.

Mr. HILL, of Colorado (at the request of Mr. HENDERSON), for 90 minutes on March 4.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. REUSS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MAILLIARD and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. VAN ZANDT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BUDGE, his remarks made in Committee of the Whole and to include a summary of a revised list of tungsten producers participating under Public Law 733 program, prepared by the staff of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. ENGLE (at the request of Mr. ASPINALL), his remarks in Committee of the Whole on H. R. 5189 and to include extraneous material.

Mr. HAGEN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SHELLEY (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. METCALF and to include extraneous matter.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 27, 1957, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

534. A letter from the Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force,

transmitting a copy of the Air Force's semi-annual report entitled "Research and Development Procurement Action Report," for the period July 1 to December 31, 1956, pursuant to Public Law 557, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

535. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act entitled 'An Act Relating to Children Born Out of Wedlock,' approved January 11, 1951"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

536. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to restrict its application in certain overseas areas, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

537. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of the proposed Alaska constitution. The original of this proposed constitution was transmitted to the President by the Governor of Alaska, pursuant to section 15 of chapter 46 of the Session Laws of Alaska, 1955; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 168. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Education and Labor to conduct studies and investigations relating to matters coming within its jurisdiction; with amendment (Rept. No. 169). Referred to the House Calendar.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. House Resolution 174. Resolution providing for sending the bill H. R. 2648 and accompanying papers to the United States Court of Claims; without amendment (Rept. No. 158). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1501. A bill for the relief of Beulah I. Reich with amendment (Rept. No. 159). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAMER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1537. A bill for the relief of Jacob Baronian; without amendment (Rept. No. 160). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAMER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1562. A bill for the relief of Maj. John P. Ruppert; with amendment (Rept. No. 161). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. POFF: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2950. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Emery A. Cook; without amendment (Rept. No. 162). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. POFF: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3322. A bill for the relief of James L. Bostwick; with amendment (Rept. No. 163). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HYDE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1359. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Theodore (Nicole Xantho) Rousseau; without amendment (Rept. No. 164). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1400. A bill for the relief of Mitsuko

A. Hachita; without amendment (Rept. No. 165). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1757. A bill for the relief of Nicola Marcello; without amendment (Rept. No. 166). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2256. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Lucie Leon (also known as Lucie Noel); with amendment (Rept. No. 167). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HILLINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 247. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens; without amendment (Rept. No. 168). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DEMPSEY:

H. R. 5301. A bill to provide a right-of-way to the city of Alamogordo, a municipal corporation of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 5302. A bill to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically depressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 5303. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the requirement that an individual must have attained the age of 50 in order to become entitled to disability insurance benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. R. 5304. A bill to provide Federal assistance to States to augment their efforts to prevent surface damage resulting from mine cave-ins; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 5305. A bill to repeal the cabaret tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H. R. 5306. A bill to provide for the establishment of a United States Foreign Relations Academy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HILLINGS:

H. R. 5307. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies," approved July 2, 1890; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. R. 5308. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to establish a domestic parity plan for wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KILGORE:

H. R. 5309. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, rehabilitate, operate, and maintain the lower Rio Grande rehabilitation project, Texas, Mercedes Division; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LENNON:

H. R. 5310. A bill to amend the Soil Bank Act to provide that one-half of any cut in acreage allotments shall be placed in the acreage reserve, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LONG:

H. R. 5311. A bill to provide that State agricultural experiment stations shall devote a portion of the appropriations made to them by the Federal Government to carry out researches with respect to the various aspects of organic farming; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MOSS:

H. R. 5312. A bill to authorize the construction of certain works for flood control

and other purposes on the Sacramento River in California; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. R. 5313. A bill to modify the upper Mississippi River Basin flood-control plan to authorize the construction of a local protection project at New Athens, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 5314. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force to make grants to certain educational institutions for the construction of military and naval science buildings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WEAVER:

H. R. 5315. A bill to amend section 203 of the National Housing Act to provide a new housing program; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H. R. 5316. A bill designating the 27th day of October in each year as Navy Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 5317. A bill to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 to reduce from 65 to 62 the age at which a single person can qualify for admission to a low-rent housing project and the age at which a family can qualify for admission to a project designed specifically for elderly families; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 5318. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction from gross income for certain amounts paid by a teacher for his further education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 5319. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies," approved July 2, 1890; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLE:

H. R. 5320. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H. R. 5321. A bill to encourage expansion of teaching and research in the education of mentally retarded children through grants to institutions of higher learning and to State educational agencies; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H. R. 5322. A bill to extend certain veterans' benefits to or on behalf of dependent husbands and widowers of female veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 5323. A bill to provide for national cemeteries in the central west coast area of the State of Florida; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DEVEREUX:

H. R. 5324. A bill to amend section 1 of the act of January 2, 1951, prohibiting the transportation of gambling devices in interstate and foreign commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 5325. A bill to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. R. 5326. A bill to amend section 213 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that amounts paid for the medical and dental care of children who have not attained the age of six shall be deductible without regard to the limitations contained in such section; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 5327. A bill to postpone the effective date of the amendments made to the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, by

Public Law 985, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 5328. A bill to amend the Medals of Honor Act to authorize awards for acts of heroism involving any motor vehicle subject to the motor carrier safety regulations of the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 5329. A bill to amend section 11 of the Clayton Antitrust Act to extend the authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission thereunder to contract carriers subject to the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5330. A bill to amend the Locomotive Inspection Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 5331. A bill to amend section 212 (a) of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H. R. 5332. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KEAN:

H. R. 5333. A bill to amend section 2011 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and section 813 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCULLOCH:

H. R. 5334. A bill to improve and extend, through reciprocal legislation, the enforcement of duties of support in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MOSS:

H. R. 5335. A bill authorizing a monetary contribution for the flood-control accomplishments of the multiple purpose Oroville Dam proposed to be constructed on the Feather River by the State of California; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. NEAL:

H. R. 5336. A bill to increase annuities payable to certain annuitants from the civil-service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 5337. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide coverage for employees of employers who are engaged in activities affecting interstate commerce, to eliminate certain exemptions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. TELLER:

H. R. 5338. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, so as to provide increases in benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H. R. 5339. A bill to authorize the National Potato Grade Labeling Act, which provides quality requirements for, and the inspection, certification, and labeling of Irish potatoes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. J. Res. 249. Joint resolution to provide for the preparation of a history of momentous scenes in the Congress since the Revolutionary War; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. J. Res. 250. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on Scientific Research; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. NICHOLSON:

H. Con. Res. 123. Concurrent resolution creating a joint committee of the Congress to attend the ceremonies to be held at Plymouth, Mass., on May 25, 1957, in connection with the landing of the *Mayflower II*; to the Committee on Rules.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of Montana: Memorial of the House of Representatives of Montana relative to construction and use of VHF television translators; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FORAND: Memorial of the Rhode Island General Assembly memorializing Congress to enact legislation to assist the States in meeting the school housing needs of children; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Also, memorial of the Rhode Island General Assembly memorializing Congress with respect to amending the Federal Social Security Act so that full benefits may be granted to women who have reached the age of 62 years instead of waiting until they reach the age of 65 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Rhode Island General Assembly memorializing Congress to enact and maintain tariff rates on textiles (including lace), jewelry, and rubber goods imports; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HESELTON: Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts memorializing the Congress of the United States for an expanded program of public housing for elderly persons; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, resolutions of the General Court, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, memorializing the Congress of the United States relative to the enactment of legislation making marital desertion and abandonment of minor children an offense under the provisions of the Federal Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN: Resolution of the General Court of Massachusetts memorializing the Congress for an expanded program of public housing for elderly citizens; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, resolution of the General Court of Massachusetts memorializing the Congress of the United States relative to the enactment of legislation making marital desertion and abandonment of minor children an offense under the provisions of the Federal Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THORNBERRY: Memorial of the Senate of the State of Texas, memorializing the President to take immediate steps to limit imports of foreign oil to the 1954 percentage of the domestic market as authorized by Congress and required for the security of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Georgia, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to take corrective measures to equalize imports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to urging approval of pending legislation which provides for a fair and just settlement to the Crow Indians, so that construction of the sorely needed Yellowstone Dam project may begin at once; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to clarify the existing provisions and further to relax the strict requirements of the Federal social security law that relates to eligibility for benefits for totally disabled persons over the age of 50 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.



## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 5340. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Catania; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASPINALL (by request):

H. R. 5341. A bill for the relief of John J. Farrelly; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 5342. A bill for the relief of Charles H. Skidmore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 5343. A bill for the relief of Elena Ramirez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5344. A bill for the relief of Sun Hsi Zen Yung (also known as Yung Sun Hsi Zen); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURNS of Hawaii:

H. R. 5345. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Haruno Miyasaka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5346. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lum Shee Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5347. A bill for the relief of La Patria Tobacco Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5348. A bill for the relief of Pedro Africa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENNISON:

H. R. 5349. A bill for the relief of Lorna Isabel Azevedo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 5350. A bill for the relief of Haralambos Athanasios Deligiannis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H. R. 5351. A bill for the relief of Harlee M. Hansley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FENTON:

H. R. 5352. A bill for the relief of Vito Pupo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRIEDEL (by request):

H. R. 5353. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Clarabelle Greene; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H. R. 5354. A bill for the relief of Stanley Lawrence Ahern; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H. R. 5355. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on certain claims of the United Foundation Corp. of Union, N. J.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LENNON:

H. R. 5356. A bill for the relief of Charles A. Sidawi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McFALL:

H. R. 5357. A bill for the relief of Geronimo Navarrete-Rivera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McINTOSH:

H. R. 5358. A bill for the relief of Hideko Nagabuchi Lafontaine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5359. A bill for the relief of Edith Elisabeth Wagner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 5360. A bill for the relief of Chan Kim Tun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OSMERS:

H. R. 5361. A bill for the relief of Marie Haladjian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. R. 5362. A bill for the relief of Hannelore Zinsel-Steege; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED:

H. R. 5363. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margaret U. Kayner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 5364. A bill for the relief of Joseph R. Flanders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5365. A bill for the relief of Robert P. Peterman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 5366. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of the heirs of Gen. John C. Fremont, the city of

San Francisco, and all other persons against the United States arising out of the seizure of certain real property by the United States Government in 1863; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SISK:

H. R. 5367. A bill for the relief of Gabriel Estrada-Salinas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5368. A bill for the relief of Jose Ascencion Orozco Ortega; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5369. A bill for the relief of Aureliano Velazco-Loera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5370. A bill for the relief of Jose Becerril Torres; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5371. A bill for the relief of Wong Chin Yuck Shee (Mrs. Chun Yuck Shee); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5372. A bill for the relief of Gisaburo Nishikawa and his wife Aya Nishikawa (nee Honda); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TELLER:

H. R. 5373. A bill for the relief of Simeon Augustus David Linton George Geogahan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5374. A bill for the relief of Dimitrios Georges Zacharias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H. R. 5375. A bill for the relief of Salvador Arce Davidson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. J. Res. 251. Joint resolution for the relief of certain creditors of the Norwood Pulp & Machinery Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

104. Mr. CANFIELD presented a petition of the Fratellanza Serinese, Inc. organization of Passaic County, N. J., adopted on February 3, 1957 at Paterson, N. J., endorsing the recommendations of President Eisenhower to revise the quota system as set forth in the present Immigration Act which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## Federal Aid for School Construction

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. PAT McNAMARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 26, 1957

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared relating to Federal aid for school construction be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

## LET US BUILD SCHOOLS

Even though the United States Chamber of Commerce was founded in 1912, I have always suspected a stubbornness on the part of that organization to acknowledge the presence of the 20th century.

Today we have further proof of the chamber's antediluvian outlook on life.

We are informed by the chamber, according to an article in the Washington Star of

February 20, that the organization is opposed to Federal aid for school construction.

This is not very shocking.

It is consistent with the chamber's apparent desire for a return to the good old days—which means government for the benefit of the robber barons and others out to gouge the public.

Efforts by the Federal Government to be genuinely helpful to all the people are summarily rejected.

But while denouncing Federal aid, the chamber also took another long step along its dusty trail back to the dark ages when it proclaimed there was actually a surplus of classrooms today.

According to this same article, the chamber puts this surplus at 14,000 classrooms.

This outrageous statement is directly contrary to the opinion of the President of the United States, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the National Education Association, a large part of Congress and the authorities of most of our States—not to mention the children stacked like cordwood in our present schools.

However, the chamber has never been known to be swayed by the facts.

I will not attempt to explain the mathematical whimsy by which the chamber of commerce arrives at this 14,000 figure. Nor do I intend to enter into a numbers game.

I don't know exactly how many classrooms we are short. But even the most conservative estimate of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare puts the current shortage at 159,000 rooms.

The shortage exists—the shortage is critical.

No distortions by the chamber of commerce can hide this basic need of our country.

Again I urge the Senate to move promptly to consider the school construction measures that have been introduced.

## Replies to Questionnaire Sent to Citizens of the Fourth District of California

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1957

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, the citizens of the Fourth District of California have again shown a commendable interest in their Government by respond-

ing in large numbers to my most recent questionnaire. One out of every sixth voter was asked to participate and, as of this date, over 20 percent have answered.

I am greatly encouraged by the substantive thought given to some of the most important current issues. The following tabulation may be of interest to my colleagues:

	Yes	No	No opinion
	Per- cent	Per- cent	Per- cent
1. Do you favor the tight money policy of the Federal Reserve Board currently used to check inflation, recognizing that this policy tends to restrict the availability of mortgage money?	72	24	4
2. Is it your belief that Congress should grant a high priority to the school-construction bill designed to meet emergency needs for more classrooms?	75	22	3
3. Does the administration's civil rights package, including a commission to investigate asserted violations of civil rights, creation of a Civil Rights Division in the Department of Justice, enforcement of voting rights, and preventive relief through civil courts, meet with your approval?	55	33	12
4. The Post Office Department wishes to offset its deficit by increasing postal rates. Do you approve of a boost in 1st-class charges to accomplish this?	59	39	2
5. Do you support the President's proposal that permanent residence be granted Hungarian refugees recently arrived here?	49	46	5
6. Would you favor special tax relief for small-business firms?	72	24	4
7. If the Federal budget is again balanced this year, would you favor some reduction in the national debt before taxes are lowered?	65	33	2
8. Would you support President Eisenhower's request for more authority to admit refugees from Communist countries?	35	60	5
9. Do you favor legislation that would provide statehood for both Hawaii and Alaska?	79	17	4
10. Do you favor stronger antitrust laws, including closer Government scrutiny of merger proposals of large companies?	73	22	5

### Civil Rights

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, February 26, 1957*

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement on civil-rights legislation as delivered to the Subcommittee on Civil Rights of the House Committee on the Judiciary:

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY, FIFTH DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, TO THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON CIVIL RIGHTS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, FEBRUARY 25, 1957

Mr. Chairman and members of the Subcommittee on Civil Rights, let me first express my thanks for the courtesy you have shown in arranging for me to appear before you today, and also to compliment you on the thoroughgoing manner in which you are proceeding in your study of the vital problem of assuring that none of our fellow citizens are denied the civil rights guaranteed them by the Constitution. Certainly when legislation is reported by this subcommittee no one can rightfully say that any aspect of the problem has been ignored, nor that full weight has not been given to all shades of opinion, pro and con. Because of my own lifelong efforts in support of equal opportunity for all races and creeds I have followed closely the progress of these hearings and those in previous Congresses. It is a tremendously good feeling to know that at last we seem to be nearing the goal of congressional action to chart such a course.

For my own part I have long believed that the United States, at a peak never reached by any nation in the history of the world, faces but two really crucial problems, and they are interrelated. The one is the relentless fight against world communism; the other the elimination of second-class citizenship as applied to any segment of our people by force of law or custom. As long as such discrimination exists in this land, based on group antagonisms rather than an evaluation of the individual as he stands on his own two feet, so long shall we be morally disunited and subject to the divisive threat of subversive forces.

We do not have to prove the existence of the problem. What we do have to prove is

that we are looking for an honest solution. Left to themselves the States and local communities have failed, and we might as well admit it. And I speak not only of the South but of countless communities in the North as well—Detroit, where a critical problem is right now receiving the attention of the press; Chicago, New York, the Southwest, where Americans of Mexican ancestry are subject to the same type of treatment as Negroes in the South; and even my own area, the west coast, to some degree.

The executive branch of the Federal Government has also failed to use either the legal means now given it under discretionary authority, or the moral force of the Presidency to act against the evil. Where the administrative will is weak or subject to political opportunism, it is the inherent duty of the Congress to provide through laws which say "shall" and not "may" the force which will implement the constitutional guarantees with which we are now concerned. The Constitution which guarantees to the States certain rights, does not guarantee them the right to do wrong. It does, however, contain in its preamble a guaranty of an overriding purpose to establish justice and to promote the general welfare and secure the blessings of liberty to all citizens, white, black, brown, yellow, or red, and it is that purpose we must now implement.

The legislation now before this subcommittee will let us take a long stride in the right direction. Your distinguished chairman and the equally distinguished ranking Republican member have both contributed much to clarifying the issues involved. By the legislation they have drafted they have charted a practical course for us to follow in beginning to right the wrongs under which generations of our fellow citizens have suffered. I personally believe that the Celler bill, H. R. 2145, because of the more explicit guide lines it lays down, should serve as the basis upon which the subcommittee acts.

The establishment of a Commission on Civil Rights to serve as an authoritative body for studying the legal and moral issues, and for formulating executive policy and recommendations is an absolute essential in bringing the executive branch of the Government to a proper exercise of its functions. As a counterpart in the Congress, the provision for a Joint Congressional Committee on Civil Rights in the Celler bill is also necessary lest we tend to delegate too much of our responsibility to the executive authorities. A third requirement in setting up the legislative and administrative framework needed for active operations in the civil-rights field

is provided for in the establishment of a Civil Rights Division in the Department of Justice. Such a new division will lay the proper stress on these functions of our law-enforcement agencies, functions which have been sadly neglected heretofore. Fourth, the Federal courts must be granted clear and undeniable jurisdiction over civil-rights violations if the framework we set up is to be complete.

However, it must be remembered that these provisions of the bills now before the subcommittee provide only a framework. If the legislative structure is to be complete, we must gird that framework with a definite body of principles and definitions upon which to act. The protection of the right to political participation and of other civil rights provided in the Celler bill, and the criminal penalties authorized for violations of these rights, are, it seems to me, an absolute minimum for our present purposes. Certainly there are other forms of discrimination widely practiced, such as that in the field of employment, to which attention must be given. But we must in deference to the great difference of views in so many of these problems, and because of the practical impossibility of immediate agreement on all phases, be content with a beginning aimed at the more basic discriminations.

I certainly agree with those who contend that mere passage of a law, however comprehensive, will not automatically solve the complex problems of racial discrimination, nor bring a new era of good feeling overnight. The deep-seated social attitudes and customs with which we are dealing are not that easily uprooted. We must be wary of any tendency to feel that once the job is begun it will finish itself. Automation has not yet reached that stage of development. The unhappy experience with the 18th amendment should be an example to us in this regard. Therefore, I feel quite strongly that we must be tolerant of intolerance to a degree at least in the initial stages of this vast undertaking. We must look to other measures than the law for a real and final solution of the unhappy problem.

In the last analysis, education must provide the answer. By that I mean not only providing book learning for those to whom it is now denied, but education in the deeper sense. We must educate ourselves to a full understanding and acceptance of the Golden Rule as it applies to our human relations with our fellow man. We must not attempt to force acceptance of a principle where we ourselves are not willing to practice it. We must, in short, use "deliberate speed" in moving toward our goal of true brotherhood, but we must begin to move toward that goal. I believe that our education has now reached the stage where a fruitful beginning is in order through the legislative processes. For that reason, I urge the subcommittee to bring out a bill which will let us take the first step.

### Aldo Leopold Memorial Award Medal

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. LEE METCALF**

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, February 26, 1957*

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, on March 5, during the annual banquet of the 22d North American Wildlife Conference here in Washington, a very high honor was bestowed on a man known to many of us in Congress as a sincere and dedicated conservationist.



Those of us who know C. R. "Pink" Gutermuth, vice president of the Wildlife Management Institute, recognize and respect his dedication to the public-spirited cause of improved natural resources management.

Before the more than 900 natural resources administrators, technicians, sportsmen, and Members of Congress attending the banquet, Gutermuth was given the Aldo Leopold Memorial Award Medal in recognition of distinguished service to wildlife conservation.

The Leopold medal and scroll, which is given by the Wildlife Society, a continentwide society of professional fish and game technicians, commemorates the late Aldo Leopold, considered by many the father of wildlife management in North America. Conferral of this coveted medal shows the great esteem and appreciation that conservationists hold for a fellow worker who has done an outstanding and monumental job in furthering the objectives of their profession.

The first Leopold Memorial Award Medal was conferred in 1951 upon Carl D. Shoemaker, former conservation director for the National Wildlife Federation. Subsequent natural resources workers who have been honored are: Dr. Olaus J. Murie, 1952; Dr. Ira N. Gabrielson, 1953; Harold Titus, 1954; Hoyes Lloyd, 1955; Dr. Clarence Cottam, 1956.

### Thomas G. Masaryk: Champion of Human Freedom

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. HENRY S. REUSS**

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, February 26, 1957*

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, a little over 100 years ago, on March 7, 1850, there was born in Moravia a man who today is revered as one of the great champions of human freedom: Thomas G. Masaryk.

Americans are particularly responsive to the greatness of Masaryk because of his own close personal association with our country, his marriage to an American, and his friendship with Woodrow Wilson. We know, too, how much he drew his inspiration from our American ideals and institutions.

But the spirit of liberty and justice knows no natural boundaries. Masaryk today has become a world figure and we Americans in turn are in his debt for the contribution he made to freedom's cause.

I think we can repay that debt in some small measure by giving new life to our determination that Czechoslovakia shall once again be free. We know that in that land—as in other lands behind the Iron Curtain—the dedication to true democracy remains undimmed by the oppressor's iron fist. We cannot today merely mouth sterile slogans, nor must we be terrified by the Soviet Union's campaign of violence. A positive pro-

gram aimed at a peaceful settlement is urgently needed.

In this endeavor, Americans of all national origins will join with heartfelt thanks that the greatness of Thomas Masaryk lives on to give us confidence that out of darkness shall come a rebirth of the freedom for which he gave his life.

### Middle East Proposals

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON**

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Tuesday, February 26, 1957*

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD remarks which I delivered before the Bernalillo County Democratic convention at Albuquerque, N. Mex., on February 18, 1957.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### MIDDLE EAST PROPOSALS

(Remarks of Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON before the Bernalillo County Democratic convention, Albuquerque, N. Mex., February 18, 1957)

This week the Senate of the United States will start its debate on the Eisenhower Middle East Resolution. Next week it expects to vote. Possibly we should ask how the Democratic Senators on the Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees have been acting in your behalf.

As you know, the combined committees reported out the Eisenhower Middle East Resolution by a vote of 20 to 8, with Senators JOHNSON of Texas and LANGER absent. There were a number of attempts made to improve the resolution and to take into consideration the basic difficulties in the areas, such as the Arab-Israeli dispute, the Suez Canal question, the Soviet Union arms traffic, and the like; but no success was achieved, as a solid Republican bloc voted down all but the Humphrey amendment which, in effect, reaffirmed the President's constitutional authority as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy and under it the power to act instantly in case our security was in danger.

It is my belief that if some of the amendments had been accepted, there would have been fewer votes against the proposal. It is my further belief that if this bill is not amended on the Senate floor in such a manner as to recognize the basic difficulties, there will be a sizable minority—possibly numbering about 25—against it.

This resolution as it was presented might have been regarded as unnecessary because the President had the constitutional right to exercise the military power and had the funds in this year's Mutual Security Act to carry out what, if any, economic ideas he may have had. However, this resolution means that we act on a unilateral basis; it means in the words of Senator RUSSELL, that despite weeks of effort to find out what the administration proposed to do in the matter of economic assistance, the Senate members of the two committees were given nothing they could hang on to, and in effect were "buying a pig in a poke."

Personally, I do not believe that the administration has a program for the Middle East. I think the resolution is a prelude to a policy, but not a policy in itself, and I am fearful that we may become committed

in an area where we will find ourselves at a great disadvantage. Some Democrats felt that the military and economic sections should be separated, others felt that more consideration should be given to the basic difficulties inherent in the area, and others felt that a grave constitutional question was involved which was both against the interest of the Congress by, in effect, giving the President some of the constitutional authority belonging to the Congress, and against the interest of the President by putting a limitation on his own constitutional powers. There is absolutely no similarity between the President's proposal on the one hand and the Greek-Turkish doctrine and the Formosa resolution on the other. No country has requested us to come into the Middle East. The situation is extremely precarious because of the instability of all the Arab States except Iraq, and unless something definite is embodied in the final draft of the resolution, its chances for ultimate success are, in my opinion, not too good.

While we all recognize that the President has a primary and great responsibility in the field of foreign affairs, it is well to keep in mind that every Senator individually, and the Senate collectively, likewise has a great stake in the field of foreign policy. If we are going into an adventure in this area of the world, I think we are entitled to know much more in the way of facts than we know at the present time. In that respect our knowledge of what we intend to do, on the basis of testimony before the committees, is practically nothing.

But the Democratic Senators on those two committees have measured up to the standards of a party of responsibility. They studied with care the proposals of the President and his Secretary of State. Senator MANSFIELD, of Montana, early delivered on the Senate floor a memorable address which was universally praised in the press as outstanding in its fairness and in its appeal for true bipartisan conduct of our foreign affairs. Senator FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, followed up his statement of January 24 with a strong Senate speech on February 11, just 1 week ago. I want to quote some sentences from it to show why reasonable and internationally minded Democratic Senators have trouble signing on the dotted line, whatever the President asks.

"In form and substance, the resolution as prepared by the administration wants something from this Chamber, the mere asking of which would have led to a national outcry under any other administration back to Washington's. It asks for a blank grant of power over our funds and Armed Forces to be used in a blank way, for a blank length of time, under blank conditions, with respect to blank nations, in a blank area. We are asked to sign this blank check in perpetuity or at the pleasure of the President, any President.

"Who will fill in," asks Senator FULBRIGHT, "all these blanks?"

"The resolution says that the President, whoever he may be at the time, shall do it. And that's not all it says. It says that in filling in the blanks, the President need not consult, much less be accountable to any other constitutional organ of Government. He shall be the counsel—judge—jury of the national interest.

"His judgment about world realities shall be the sole warrant for his deeds in committing our forces to battle and our funds to who knows what purpose.

"His office shall be the only archive holding the record of his transactions, except as he reports the results once a year to the Congress.

"And, finally, he shall decide autonomously when his autonomous powers shall expire."

Now I say to you that in situations like this one we need representatives in the Congress—and this convention is held to select

the delegates who will pick the proper one in the State Democratic convention—who will not be afraid to take time to consider the implications of every Presidential proposal and then vote upon each as they believe the welfare of the Nation demands.

It has been 10 years since I sat in the Cabinet Room of the White House and discussed with a group of the Nation's leaders headed by President Truman, the need for aid to Greece and Turkey if these lands were not to surrender to the pressures of communism. A great Republican statesman sat just at my right, the late Arthur Vandenberg of Michigan. The situation in Congress was comparable to the present—only reversed. The Congress then as now was controlled by the opposite political party to the President. I have not forgotten that the Republican Senators of 1947 exercised their full right to proceed with caution on the statesmanlike proposals of President Harry S. Truman for the aid of Greece and Turkey. I will neither be surprised nor shocked if Democratic Senators 10 years later examine with equal care the much more drastic proposals of President Eisenhower to stabilize conditions in that same area.

Every mile of the road is marked with signs reading, "Proceed With Caution." What the administration asked us to do was not to pass a simple Senate resolution expressing our composite view, nor a concurrent resolution in which the House of Representatives added its voice, but a joint resolution which when signed by the President has the force of law, and thus becomes a blanket transfer to the Executive of the constitutional right vested in the Congress to declare war.

I am ready and willing to vote for a resolution which clearly states and pledges the support of the Senate to the President as he seeks to oppose the spread of Communist influence in the Middle East. With the amendment proposed by Senator HUMPHREY, a Democrat, of Minnesota, and adopted by the two Senate committees engaged in the Middle East hearings, I believe the resolution comes closer to that objective and I shall probably vote for it. But the span of hearings and debate upon it has persuaded me, if I needed any proof or persuasion, that the position of Representative in Congress is one of tremendous importance to the people of New Mexico, and that the Democratic Party should do its utmost to select a strong candidate and win the April election in an impressive manner.

## Today's Republicanism Is in Essence the Republicanism of Abraham Lincoln

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1957

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, during the Lincoln Day period it was my privilege to address a series of Lincoln Day dinners throughout the State of Pennsylvania, sponsored by the various Republican county committees. The final address in the series was delivered at the annual Lincoln-Washington dinner held at Greensburg, Pa., February 22, 1957, under the auspices of the Westmoreland County Republican Committee. The address follows:

It is a distinct honor to join you on this occasion as you pay deserving tribute to the immortal Abraham Lincoln.

It is a happy coincidence that this Lincoln Day Dinner is being held on the birthday of the first President—the Father of our Country—George Washington.

For years there have been friendly debates over the question as to who was the greatest American—Washington or Lincoln. While the issue is still a topic of discussion, nevertheless, the names of George Washington and Abraham Lincoln will always be enshrined in the hearts of the American people.

This year, the Republican Party through these Lincoln Day Dinners observes the 148th anniversary of the birth of the 16th President of the United States—the martyred Lincoln.

Abraham Lincoln was a self-made man. A pioneer farm boy, he had barely a full year of formal schooling. He was truly a man of the people who worked as a hired man on a farm, on a flatboat crew, as a rail splitter and a store clerk. Then he was a storekeeper, a village postmaster, a surveyor and a soldier.

He owed his outstanding quality of humanity and his deep insight into the hearts and minds of the people to this training in the school of real life. Continuing his self-education, he studied law and entered politics. He became a fabulous figure as a successful trial lawyer in Illinois. He served in the State legislature and for a term in Congress.

When the Republican Party was founded, Lincoln became one of its early leaders. He gained nationwide attention in a series of debates with Senator Douglas. From this point he moved forward as a gifted son of the United States. His feet were planted on the path of destiny to the Presidency—and his martyrdom.

Lincoln and the Republican Party led the Nation during the greatest crises any free government ever endured. Together they saved the Union and won equality for all men.

Today Republicanism is in essence the Republicanism of Abraham Lincoln. It is an up-to-date application of his enduring principles. It is a projection of Lincoln's principles into the age of atomic energy, electronics and guided missiles. Truly, it is 20th century application of a faith which was firmly founded in the age of steam and muskets.

It is a faith based on Lincoln's timeless statement that:

"The legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done but cannot do at all or cannot so well do for themselves in their separate and individual capacities.

"In all that the people can individually do as well for themselves government ought not to interfere."

This is basic Republicanism. This is—and always has been—the philosophy of the Republican Party.

President Eisenhower referred to Lincoln's philosophy last April 3, when speaking on The Function of Government he said:

"There we try to stick to the old Lincolnian dictum that it is the function of Government to do for people those things—(they) could not do for themselves and to stay out of things in places where the people can do things for themselves.

"We would hope, therefore, to have wisdom in Government to help distinguish the line beyond which Government should not go and yet be courageous in doing those things that it should do."

This is today's Republicanism as defined in the words of President Eisenhower—a Republicanism forged out of time and tested by the strains and stresses of this atomic age.

The Eisenhower administration has followed this Lincoln philosophy in its actions and its programs. It has taken to heart Lincoln's words: "To us it appears . . . the best sort of principle . . . the principle of allowing the people to do as they please with their own business."

The Eisenhower administration has restored the confidence of America in the free-enterprise system. It has chopped away at the systems of controls inherited from previous administrations. It has created a climate in which free enterprise can function at its best to bring us prosperity and full employment.

In the field of social legislation the Eisenhower administration has broadened and increased railroad and civil-service retirement benefits. New programs have been put into effect to help our farmers. New loan funds have been made available to help complete rural electrification, to improve rural telephone service, to aid small businesses. Funds have been made available to continue guarantees on GI mortgages.

A slum-clearance program is going full blast to make our large cities better places in which to live.

The Hungarian refugee program is under way on an expanded basis.

The Eisenhower program for modern highways was enacted—a program of today's Republicanism to meet today's travel needs.

A modern school construction program remains a prime goal of the Republican Party—the party of peace, progress, and prosperity.

This forward-looking program of Modern Republicanism is in keeping with Lincoln's administration which encouraged the building of railroads to link East with West.

It also provided funds from Federal land sales for State agricultural and mechanical colleges—a program constantly trying to determine and solve the needs of all our people.

While doing all of these things, financial stability has been achieved. We are operating under a balanced budget—the first in almost a decade. Much effort has been made to put the Hoover Commission recommendations into effect and to add to the efficiency and economical operation of our Government.

As under Lincoln, the Republican Party is once again standing firm for the principle of equal rights for all men. Under the Republicans, today great strides are being taken in the fight against discrimination and injustice. The Republican policy of firmness and strength has gotten us out of one war and kept us out of others. We have made no secret diplomatic deals even with our allies. We stand for the right even when our friends do wrong. We worked to stop war in Egypt and are working to keep the peace.

Another quality inherited from Lincoln is a deep and ingrained respect for our constitutional republican form of government. As Lincoln said in his first inaugural address: "A majority held in restraint by constitutional checks and limitations and always changing easily with deliberate changes of popular opinion and sentiments is the only true sovereign of a free people."

President Eisenhower, in his speech at San Francisco accepting renomination, said that the Republican Party "is the party of long-range principle not short-term expediency." He went on to say that "Our Founding Fathers showed us how the Federal Government could exercise its responsibility for leadership while stopping short of the kind of interference that deadens local vigor, variety, initiative, and imagination."

This respect for the rules and limits of our Constitution is typical of the Republican Party. The Republican Party of today has retained from Lincoln's time a great quality—that of moderation. As Lincoln said, "Now let us harmonize, my friends, and appeal to the moderation and patriotism of the people."

Harmony and moderation are the keynote of the present Republican administration.

Never have the people of the United States been so at peace with themselves—so prosperous, so satisfied. This Eisenhower administration—yes; this Republican administration—has been one of good will to all. The



pettiness, personal animosities, and appeals to class hatred of previous administrations have no part in this one.

What a contrast exists, ladies and gentlemen, when you compare what took place during the 20 years under the New Deal and the Fair Deal. They sought to substitute a Government-planned and controlled economy for the free, competitive, private economy which made this Nation the greatest wealth-producing nation in the world.

Remember how the New Deal tried to regiment all American industry into codes in a Government-dominated NRA? Remember how New Dealers set up Government corporations in competition with our own citizens and pressed for Government monopolies over electric power? Remember how they tried to spread Government-controlled TVA's to other parts of the country in disregard of State lines and interests?

By piling bureau upon bureau and by extending the long arm of the Federal Government into every activity in the land, the New Dealers sought to make the farmer, factory manager, worker, and other large segments of our population subservient to Federal decrees and dependent upon Federal hand-outs.

Remember how the Fair Dealers kept production, wage, price, and rent controls long after the war was over? Remember how they tried to seize the steel industry, how they tried to draft railroad workers into the Army in order to force them back to work, and how they continuously raised taxes on all our people until the Government's tax bill demanded a quarter of the Nation's income?

Frankly, during the 20 years of Democratic rule the New Dealers and Fair Dealers had the Nation on a toboggan slide down the road to socialism.

Yes, ladies and gentlemen, down the road to socialism. And even though they were repudiated at the polls in 1952, and again by an increasing majority in 1956, yet this same group of New Dealers and Fair Dealers are today not only fighting to take over the Democratic Party, lock, stock, and barrel, but they are playing the role of a wrecking crew in their efforts to create disunity within the ranks of the Republican Party.

Regardless of what the Eisenhower administration proposes, whether it be a program for national defense or foreign or domestic policy, spokesmen for the New Deal-Fair Deal forces never miss an opportunity to launch vicious, personal, and partisan attacks on the Eisenhower administration in general, and in particular on President Eisenhower, Vice President Nixon, and Secretary of State Dulles.

These self-styled "liberals" who are experts in the field of political sniping charge the Eisenhower administration with failure of foreign policy, especially in the Middle East; yet former Democratic President Harry S. Truman on last January 1 said:

"If I were now a Member of the Senate, I would support the request of the President for congressional authority to use the Armed Forces of the United States against any Communist or Communist-dominated aggressor in the Middle East.

"And I would quickly approve granting him the funds he seeks to extend economic aid to help the Middle East nations maintain their independence."

In the field of national defense this New Deal-Fair Deal wrecking crew charges that the Eisenhower administration has weakened our national defenses, yet the military brains of the Nation have assured the American people time and time again that the United States has the greatest concentration of military force in its peacetime history.

Let me read a recent statement of Representative CARL VINSON, Democrat of Georgia and chairman of the House Committee on

Armed Services, of which I am a member. Chairman VINSON said on February 1, 1957:

"The armed services have built not only strong defenses but have the ability to bring devastation on any nation that starts a war.

"The Military Establishment," he said, "was built for the defense of freedom and for the purpose of preserving peace, but it is capable of waging war, if necessary."

Echoing the attack they made in last fall's campaign in regard to the rise in the cost of living the New Deal-Fair Deal wrecking crew conveniently forgets that since President Eisenhower took office in 1953 inflation has been halted, the increase in the cost of living has been held to 3.6 percent, the dollar stabilized—and above all, we have full employment as well as increases in wages and purchasing power.

Then too, we are at peace with the world, with the American people accepting the 3.6 percent increase in the cost of living in preference to the wholesale slaughter of American youth on the battlefields of the world.

The New Deal-Fair Deal wrecking crew forgets that under Democratic President Harry S. Truman the cost of living from April 1945 to December 1952 rose 50 percent and that during his last term in the White House the cost of living increased 11 percent.

This same group claims that the Democratic Party is alone the friend of the common man. This myth is exploded when you study the tax record of the Democratic Party which shows that when they took over the Government of the United States in 1933 a married man with 2 children paid \$68 in Federal income tax if he had an income of \$5,000—but in 1952, when the Democratic rule ended, he was paying \$461, or nearly 7 times as much. Since 1952, the Republican Party has granted two tax reductions which returned to the pockets of the wage earner and his family \$2 out of every \$3 granted in tax relief.

So, ladies and gentlemen, you can use your own judgment as to which political party is really the friend of the so-called common man.

The vicious personal and partisan attacks that led to twisting and distorting facts proved futile in last fall's campaign when the Democrats could not find a real issue they could use against the team of Eisenhower and Nixon despite the fact that during the Democratic-controlled 84th Congress they launched 218 congressional investigations and inquiries at a cost of nearly \$9¼ million.

The present Democratic-controlled 85th Congress is at it again and to date has appropriated nearly \$3 million for all sorts of investigations on every phase of Government as administered by President Eisenhower and his Republican administration. These investigations are designed to develop issues to be used against the Republican Party in the 1958 congressional campaigns.

In mentioning 1958, let me emphasize its importance because it has a twofold significance to every resident of Pennsylvania. First, we have to rid our State capital of the Leader administration by electing a Republican Governor and giving him a supporting Republican State legislature. Secondly, we have to elect a Republican United States Senator and Republican Members of the House of Representatives to support President Eisenhower.

If our efforts are successful in 1958, our success will mean the end to divided government in Harrisburg where we have a Democratic Governor and a Republican legislature—and in Washington where we have a Republican President and a Democratic Congress.

Experience over the years has proved that a divided Government does not function in the best interests of the American people.

Having mentioned 1958 as a crucial election year, let me make a few timely observations. To begin with, we are going to be faced with a militant Democratic Party

headed by Governor Leader and gloating over its victory last fall in electing a Democratic Congress including Democratic Senator from Pennsylvania despite President Eisenhower's impressive victory.

Do you know that a study of the 1956 election results reveals that Republican congressional candidates last November ran over 7 million votes behind the 35½ million ballots cast for President Eisenhower?

In plain words, ladies and gentlemen, over 7 million voters who favored President Eisenhower did not even bother to vote for Republican congressional candidates.

This fact is alarming mainly because in 1958 we will not have President Eisenhower on the ticket. In other words, we Republicans will have to row the political boat alone. This situation hurls a challenge at the Republican Party. Mark you, to meet this challenge face-to-face we must rededicate ourselves to Republican principles and especially the Eisenhower brand of Modern Republicanism. In so doing, let us resolve to spend more time and effort at the precinct level in the education of voters on the objectives and accomplishments of the Republican Party.

Let us elect to public office Republicans in whom the voters have absolute confidence and respect. In short, let us become political missionaries by preaching the gospel of true Republicanism, thus building a more vigorous and dynamic Republican Party.

Ladies and gentlemen, we can take pardonable pride in the fact that the Republican Party—the party of Abraham Lincoln—is the party of the future. It is growing in strength because it is attracting to its ranks thinking men and women of all political faiths.

In its early days a large percentage of the founders of the Republican Party from all walks of life were former Democrats who felt that their old party was not true to its original ideals and who, therefore, turned to the Republican Party as the true party of the people. In recent years, as more and more Americans felt that the party of their choice was not living up to its principles, the Republican vote for President rose from less than 17 million in 1936 to more than 35½ million in 1956.

Many of these Americans are going the full distance and becoming active in the ranks of the Republican Party which more nearly meets their ideals. The Republican Party welcomes all Americans to its ranks to participate in the building of a better future—a future in the true tradition of Abraham Lincoln.

The up-to-date application of Lincoln principles under sound Republican leadership has brought peace, prosperity, and progress to America. The United States is the strongest hope of a troubled world. Because of this the points of agreement between Americans are growing stronger every day under the principles of Republicanism. Differences are settled by ballots, not by bullets. Never before in the history of the world have so many of the good things of life been shared in such abundance by so many Americans. America's progress is of a material and spiritual nature and is reflected by new homes—new factories—new autos—a greater interest in religion—and a stronger determination for peace.

Therefore, on this occasion, as we commemorate the 148th anniversary of the birth of the immortal Abraham Lincoln, let us face the future with renewed confidence because of the realization that, as Republicans, we have gone far toward living up to Lincoln's words:

"With malice toward none—with charity for all—with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in \* \* \* to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and all nations."

## A National Grammar Commission

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. HARLAN HAGEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 26, 1957

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation which would establish a National Grammar Commission to be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate which shall have the usual prerogative of a national commission and a specific purpose to be carried out. In this instance, the purpose is that of research into the rules of spelling and grammar deemed to be desirable for use of the English language in the United States. The product of such research would be the establishment of an official dictionary of reformed spelling and grammar. Once established, this dictionary would serve as the directive for the reproduction of material by the United States Government and its officials and employees with the hope that usages established would become common in our society generally.

This legislation was introduced by me at the request of Mr. Homer Wood, of Porterville, Calif. Mr. Wood is presently the publisher of a daily newspaper in that city. In addition to his newspaper experience, he has in his background a qualification to practice law and experience in the administration of courts. For some time he has been concerned with the problems created by the inadequacies of our grammar and spelling. He is convinced that the establishment of a more scientific system of spelling and grammar would result in a saving of tens of millions of dollars and would ease considerably the burden of our educators with a correlative improvement in the language usage habits of our citizens. The proposal has received wide publicity already.

I am convinced that there is much merit in it. Neither Mr. Wood nor myself visualize that such a commission would establish a complete new method of spelling, phonetic or otherwise, or the abandonment of a substantial portion of our rules of grammar. The commission would make its attack on the most obvious inadequacies of our language usage. In other words, the proposals of the first grammar commission would be moderate. Experience would demonstrate to what extent more radical changes in our language usage would be desirable, but the initial effort would be modest according to my conception. The proposal contained in my bill is not original because efforts have been made in the past in various quarters to rationalize language usage which I will give you briefly from the history of such efforts and from the justifications announced in the past.

In 1550, the poet Ronsard said:

Thou shouldst not put any letters in words if thou dost not pronounce them.

Since that time, scholars and learned men of every generation have attempted to simplify the spelling of the language.

English, which in most respects is considered a relatively simple language to master, has the most difficult spelling of all. Down through the years, there have been attempts to simplify other languages such as Dutch, French, Norwegian, and Spanish.

Why is such a reform desirable? Reform, when it means improvement, is always desirable. Spelling reform would tend to give the language greater uniformity in pronunciation. It would save time, space, labor, and money. The question of economy is more far-reaching than we might suppose. It occurs day after day and year after year in many countless ways. Think of the hours that a child wastes in school learning to read—hours that could be saved by easier reading. Think of the hours wasted in learning to spell words in which letters and the pronunciation are entirely different. The battle with spelling does not end there. It is a continuous process through life—keeping up and perfecting the knowledge of spelling. It means countless hours wasted at the dictionary consulting the spelling of a word. Then, too, he spends much time in the needless task of writing silent letters. The cost of printing the silent letters runs into the millions of dollars for each generation. Yet, many people defend silent letters by pleading their advantage in the study of etymology. That etymologies would be obscured by the use of simplified spelling is not true. The fact is that etymologies would be clarified—few would be obscured and none would be lost. Finally, the present system of spelling is a hindrance in modern education. It is difficult for a child to learn and difficult for the teacher to teach. A simplified system would save many teaching hours. It would have greater rewards for the child and hence would be of greater interest to him. All of these arguments have been set forth many times. Because they are true, they cannot be repeated too often.

Other languages have adopted reforms in spelling. Because of the differences of writing and printing methods used in the various parts of Germany a conference of delegates was held at Dresden in October 1872. Dr. Falk, the Prussian Minister of Education, proposed that Professor von Raumer should prepare a report on the need for reform. The reforms were prepared, sent to the various governments and then submitted to a ministerial commission composed of Von Raumer and 11 other scholars. The commission met in January 1876 and, with certain modifications, approved the reforms. The reformed spelling was then required to be taught in all schools.

In Denmark, in the 1800's the reform movement resulted in an official decree confirming certain regulations. This decree, however, was not made obligatory.

Spain has been designated as one of the languages with the simplest forms of spelling. In 1741 the Spanish Academy laid down the principles for the spelling of Spanish.

Pronunciation must have for its sole and universal rule, that by it alone there can always be known with what letter the sound should be written. (La pronunciación se debe tener por regla única y universal siempre

que por ella sola se puede conocer con que letra se ha de escribir la voz.)

More recently, the French Government has requested a report on spelling and other grammar reforms for their native language. In 1950 the Conseil Supérieur de l'Education Nationale requested that such a report be made, and the findings of the Commission de Réforme were made public in 1952. The commission was headed by M. A. Beslais, director of primary education for all France. The report includes the recommendation that what Beslais calls "parasite consonants"—that is, silent letters—be thrown out altogether. In addition, the report recommends that certain letters be dropped and others substituted in the alphabet. M. Beslais says that there is no reason for children in this modern day and age to spell words the same way that their grandparents spelled them. Children of today have too much to learn. The report quotes the decree of the Conseil Supérieur de l'Education Nationale of 1901, which said that tolerance should be shown to any student who used poor spelling on his exams provided that the student showed intelligence. M. Beslais further stated that the reforms should be started with the children entering in the first grade and not with adults. In conformance with the decree of 1901, tolerance would be shown for student use of simplified spelling in the higher grades. The report states:

In 10 years, reformed spelling will have an existence parallel to the orthography of today and in a generation it will have practically eliminated it.

In addition to the spelling reform, the report also deals with the reform of some rules of grammar which might have an even greater effect than the proposed spelling changes. But before these reforms go into effect, they must be approved by the Conseil Supérieur de l'Education Nationale.

There have been several reform movements for the English language, both in spelling and other forms of grammar. In the late 1800's, 130 British school boards petitioned the education department for a Royal Commission to study the matter. The British Social Science Association, the Philological Society of England, the American Philological Association, and the Spelling Reform Association asked for reforms. In 1877, the State Teachers' Association of New York appointed a committee to ask the State legislature to create a commission to study reform spelling. In 1878, a petition in favor of reform spelling was presented to the Senate and the House of Representatives.

Many prominent men have advocated spelling reform in the English language. Among these are Theodore Roosevelt, George Bernard Shaw, and Colonel Robert McCormick.

In 1906, Theodore Roosevelt had the following to say about the proposed spelling reform:

Most of the criticism of the proposed step is evidently made in entire ignorance of what the step is, no less than in entire ignorance of the very moderate and commonsense views as to the purposes to be achieved,



which views are so excellently set forth in the circulars to which I have referred. There is not the slightest intention to do anything revolutionary or initiate any far-reaching policy.

They represent nothing in the world but a very slight extension of the unconscious movement which has made agricultural implement makers and farmers write "plow" instead of "plough"; which has made most Americans write "honor" without the somewhat absurd, superfluous "u"; and which is even now making people write "program" without the "me."

It is not an attack on the language of Shakespeare and Milton, because it is in some instances a going back to the forms they used, and in others merely the extension of changes which, as regards other words, have taken place since their time.

It is not an attempt to do anything far-reaching or sudden or violent, or indeed anything very great at all. It is merely an attempt to cast what slight weight can properly be cast on the side of the popular forces which are endeavoring to make our spelling a little less foolish and fantastic.

George Bernard Shaw was a life-long advocate of simplified spelling, punctuation, orthography, and phonetics. He advocated the use of spaced letters instead of italics. Shaw wrote many articles on the subject, some of which are as follows: A Plea for Speech Nationalization, the Morning Leader, August 22, 1901; The Dying Tongue of Great Elizabeth, the Saturday Review, February 11, 1905; and Orthography of the Bomb, the Times, December 27, 1945.

Col. Robert McCormick used many of the simplified spelling rules in his newspaper, the Chicago Tribune, all during the time that he controlled the newspaper. He was a firm believer in the benefits derived from simplified spelling.

One other report in connection with grammar reform that should be cited is the Joint Committee on Grammatical Nomenclature. This committee was appointed by the National Education Association, the Modern Language Association of America, and the American Philological Association. Its report was first published in 1913 and reprinted in 1929. In the report, it states the following concerning its purpose:

The adoption of a system of identical nomenclature for identical phenomena in all the languages of our family which the student may take up, with its natural accompaniment of differing nomenclature at the points where the phenomena differ, would have the effect of making these differences stand out more sharply in his mind.

And it is believed, therefore, not only that the acceptance of the system recommended will at once lead to a state of things much more satisfactory than the present one, but also that the greater part of the system will successfully stand the test of future thought; while the general use of it will at the same time direct attention more sharply upon points at which its results may at some future day be bettered.

If we look at the grammar books of today, we find that the nomenclature used differs from textbook to textbook. It is true that there is a greater degree of conformity than in the past, but a uniform system still has never been adopted.

Much has been written on the subject of reform in the past. Reform is still being advocated by the scholars of today. Yet nothing has been done about making

official recommendations for reform. A National Grammar Commission, authorized by the Government, would have that power. It would make our grammar as much a part of this modern age in which we live as has modern industry.

## United States Foreign Policy Today and Tomorrow

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 26, 1957

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on February 11 the distinguished minority leader, the senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] inaugurated the first of a series of lectures at Georgetown University. The lectures are a part of the Father Edmund A. Walsh lecture series. On that occasion the distinguished minority leader made a speech, which I believe to be entitled not only to the consideration of this body, but also to the consideration of the House of Representatives and the country as a whole. As usual, he was constructive and fair-minded, and he laid before the American people a proposition for their consideration.

Mr. President, on last evening I had the opportunity and the honor of following the distinguished senior Senator from California, at which time I spoke on the subject "United States Foreign Policy Today and Tomorrow." I ask unanimous consent that the speech I made last evening at Georgetown University be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY TODAY AND TOMORROW

(Address by Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, Democrat, Montana, Father Edmund A. Walsh lecture series, Georgetown University, February 25, 1957)

More than 35 years ago the late Father Edmund A. Walsh saw the fulfillment of a dream for which he had labored with steadfastness of purpose and great energy. It was the foundation at Georgetown University of the school of Foreign Service which now, fittingly, bears his name.

The circumstances of its birth are familiar to you all. A terrible war had ended. Father Walsh recognized the demands which coming events would make upon the intellectual resources of the Nation. He properly estimated the importance of having an informed citizenry and a trained and dedicated personnel to discharge the responsibilities of this country in the cause of world peace.

Yet Father Walsh could not have anticipated the extent to which the life of our people was to be dominated by the subject of foreign policy, or the scope of its development. The world is quite a different place today from what it appeared 35 years ago. When I was a student, our problems, our interests were predominantly local or national. We were concerned almost exclusively with domestic matters. The United States was an immense country, so immense

that even what happened on the west coast touched the east but lightly. Our relations with foreign governments were for the very few who were qualified to understand the meaning of incidents around the globe.

Today one has only to look at the curriculum of the average university to appreciate the extent of our preoccupation with foreign affairs. Main Street knows, and insists on knowing, why Washington proceeds in one way or another; for Main Street is directly affected by decisions on countless matters to which, a few decades ago, it paid little or no attention. Areas of the world which were merely places in a book are common topics of conversation, because they are vital to our national interest.

Foreign policy has become the business of everyone. And it is just about the biggest business of our Government right now. National defense, commerce, and agriculture are all involved in the determination of our policy toward other nations. Tangible proof of this regularly comes across my desk.

A few days ago I received a routine distribution of Department of State press releases. One of these dealt with an agreement for the sale of United States surplus agricultural commodities to Korea under Public Law 480. The purpose of this agreement was to assist in stabilizing the Korean grain market and the entire Korean price structure. Defense equipment will be procured by the Korean currency generated in the transaction.

Another press release informed me that the United States and Mexico had reached agreement on the use of standard band radio broadcasting channels. Another set forth the latest facts concerning the failure by the Chinese Communists to release imprisoned Americans, as they had undertaken to do. Still another contained word that the Italian Government had notified the United States of its intention to limit the export of velveteens to this country during 1957 to 1.37 million square yards.

Now, this was only one day's announcements. But observe the broad range of subjects involving issues of foreign policy, which bear directly on activities of our people within the United States. Decisions of our Government in the field of foreign relations reach down into every corner and crossroad of the country, affecting the farmer, the blouse manufacturer, the dairy producer, the watchmaker, the wheat rancher, the radio broadcaster. This trend will grow, as the world is more closely knit together, as technology advances and as the major problems of each nation are identified with the problems of every other nation. In the past 10 years we have concluded almost 2,000 agreements with other governments on matters of mutual concern.

If the United States is to be equipped adequately to meet these problems, our reservoir of human talent will have to be enlarged. There will be more and more demands for trained personnel in overseas posts. At the present time there are approximately 100,000 Americans working abroad. If current trends continue, it is not unlikely that in another 25 years that figure will reach 200,000.

Yet before the Second World War the average college graduate gave hardly a thought to utilizing his special training in foreign countries. The opportunities inviting him abroad today are so many and so attractive, even apart from the career Foreign Service, that they should not be overlooked in the planning of a graduate's future. As the intercourse of nations widens, the burden of universities to feed this reservoir will grow heavier. We are already feeling the pinch, in a shortage of those skills we should like to make available to other governments—particularly engineering—under the point 4 program.

The development of a competent corps of overseas personnel, and particularly of the

career service, is a most vital matter for the future of this Nation.

No policy, no matter how brilliantly conceived, can be effective unless it is executed with skill. Even more important the actual policy which is adopted will, in large measure, be determined by the resourcefulness, ability, and quality of the men and women who represent the United States Government in the field. This is what is meant when it is sometimes said that foreign policy is made by the cables to the Department of State. To a considerable degree this is true. Yet, as impelling and compulsive as those cables may be, it is what the Secretary of State does with them which, in final analysis will measure the success or failure of a policy. The freedom of action they permit may often be very restricted. Yet within those narrow limits, a decision must be made, and made correctly. Peace and war may hinge upon it. Certainly the recent events of the Middle East have evidence how true this is.

To an outsider, to one not in a position to appraise all the facts, the policy indicated in a particular situation may seem to offer no difficulty. The question may appear clearcut, black and white, an open and shut case.

But things are not always what they seem—not even in foreign relations. We cannot always do what we might like to do. Let me cite just one example: During the last session Congress received mounting protests from eastern cotton blouse and shirt manufacturers against ruinous competition from Japanese exporters. The Japanese were able to market their finished product here for about one-fourth of what identical cotton goods could be sold in this country. Some American plants had already closed down in consequence. And so, pressures grew for an increase in tariff rates against the Japanese blouses. A simple and obvious solution—or so it seemed.

But when the Committee on Foreign Relations held hearings on a bill introduced for that purpose, we found it was not so simple or obvious. Japan was manufacturing shirts from cotton imported from the United States. In fact, Japan has been the largest single export market for American cotton growers. To deny the Japanese the American market would have inflicted serious injury upon American agriculture. A particular segment of industry would have been protected at the expense of a much larger branch of our agriculture. The Carolina shirtmakers—and I might add, a great many newspapers—could see only a local consequence, not the overriding national interest on which the policy decision had to be based. Their remedy might well have been worse than the disease. Happily, Japan by a self-imposed quota on exports to this country has partially relieved the tension.

I have oversimplified this illustration for convenience. But there was a more subtle point involved. We were not only dealing with a tariff and trade problem. Indirectly, had the bill passed we would have been tinkering with the national security. It is, of course, to our interest that Japan should find an adequate outlet for her exports, if it is to maintain a viable economy. Unless Japan can do business with the West and the so-called neutralist powers, it may be forced to draw closer to the Communist trade orbit. Such may well prove to be the ultimate outcome, in any event; and I do not wish to imply that American business should be sacrificed to the trade requirements of another Government. I merely mention this as one of the many veiled elements in what, on the surface, appeared to be a relatively uncomplicated problem.

I do not believe that ever before in our history, at least in peacetime, have we been so preoccupied with the security of the United States, as we have been during the past 10 years. The quest for national security preempts almost every other issue in

the life of our country; directly or indirectly it cuts across both domestic and foreign policies. It dominates the budget; it is a brake upon atomic progress for peaceful purposes; it is the principal cause for the growth in the national debt, the drop in the value of our dollar, and the burden of taxation which you and I must carry. And, most regrettably, there is little on the visible horizon to encourage the hope that the search for security will not continue to be the principal concern of American foreign policy for the next decade. The general elements in that policy are, as you well know, support for the United Nations, the system of regional defense pacts capped by NATO and the Rio Treaty, and our foreign-aid program. All these have the same predominant purpose—security.

We are all aware that the broad lines of our foreign policy have been conditioned for the past 10 years by the designs of the Soviet Government. And as long as that Government seeks control over the rest of the world, it will not be possible for the people of the United States to cultivate with the people of Russia those bonds of human friendships which could enrich their existence and ours. Years in advance of most of his contemporaries, Father Walsh, who visited Russia not long after the revolution, sounded a warning to this country of the peril which the Soviet Union offered.

We have seen a reflection of that peril in Hungary. That tragic episode has caused a worldwide reappraisal of a principal source of Soviet power. It is recognized to a larger degree than ever before throughout the world that this source is naked force. It is clearer now that in the satellite countries, at least, Soviet control is maintained largely by force of arms or threat of force. Given any kind of a chance, the oppressed peoples of central Europe will light the flame of freedom again and again.

The emergence of Russia as the most powerful nation in Europe and Asia has compelled a course of action upon the United States and a preoccupation with the problems of other nations which would have been unthinkable a few decades ago. And yet it is not, in my view, necessarily the most significant long-range political development of recent years insofar as our policy is concerned. Nor is the emergence of China as an industrial society, nor indeed the effect of atomic energy on world relations.

I think one of the most shattering events in our time so far as United States foreign policy is concerned, has been the impact of developments affecting the United Kingdom. For it was Britain during the 19th and early 20th century that played the role of world policeman; and it is no mere accident that this period coincided with what now seems like the golden age of international law and order. By and large, an agreement between nations then was meant to be kept. It was not a treacherous artifice employed to bring down a government's guard, an instrument of hostility bound with a red ribbon. The sanctity it received was undoubtedly due to the fact that the nations of Europe respected their heritage of Christian morality in a manner foreign to the Soviet tradition. Indeed, the Soviets have taken advantage of this very heritage.

Because the relative decline of British power has occurred in our lifetime, its ultimate effects may appear more obscure than they very likely will to a historian 50 years hence. To this country, however, it has already meant a vast increase in worldwide responsibilities. You have only to glance at a map of the world to see some of its immediate consequences. One of these consequences we can see right now, in the Middle East.

Before I go any further into that matter, let me make one thing clear. During the last

15 years, the executive branch under both Republicans and Democrats has frequently invoked the so-called principle of bipartisanship to obtain congressional backing for the conduct of foreign relations. I do not view bipartisanship—or, more accurately, nonpartisanship—other than as cooperation with the President on policy proposals which merit cooperation. It does not, and it cannot, signify blind acceptance of any policy merely because the Executive tells us it is a good policy and that it is needed. Nor does it signify announcing a policy first, then informing congressional leaders afterward. This administration, as administrations before it, can make unwise decisions. And Members of Congress have a duty to the American people to criticize constructively, and oppose any policy which does not seem to them to serve the national interest.

I would like to emphasize the word "constructively." For the purpose of criticism of our foreign policy must be to make it a better policy if the national interests are to be served.

Yesterday morning we had an example of responsibility when Secretary Dulles met—for 2 hours—with the congressional leadership to discuss amendments to the Mid-East Resolution and the question of sanctions. The meeting was both fruitful and worth while. Mr. Dulles is to be commended for the frankness and understanding he displayed.

Last week we had another example of the effectiveness of genuine bipartisanship or what I prefer to call responsible cooperation between the President and Congress. You will recall that President Eisenhower conferred with members of both parties at the White House on the crisis in the Middle East. I attended this serious, nonpolitical conference on matters which affect the vital interests of all the people of the United States. There was a free and frank exchange of ideas. Members of Congress came away with a better understanding of the situation which confronts us in the Middle East. On his part, the President obtained the views of members of both parties. This meeting last week, and the Dulles meeting on yesterday, may well mark a new start in the field of responsible cooperation between the executive and legislative branches of our Government.

On the night of the meeting last week, the President, in response to a suggestion by the distinguished Senator RUSSELL of Georgia, addressed the entire Nation. In his speech, Mr. Eisenhower made clear for the first time the scope and gravity of the situation in the Middle East. I do not agree with all of the propositions which he advanced. It is not necessary to agree with all of them, however, in order to recognize in his address the beginnings of a more intelligible policy directed at the problems of the Middle East. Because he had spoken with Members of Congress, the President was in a far better position to talk not only to the people of the United States but to the people of the Middle East and the world as well. That was because, in calling the conference which preceded his speech, the President was availing himself of a cross-section of both party and regional leadership.

May I say at this point that there is, I believe, a somewhat mistaken concept that the Democratic Party is run by only one section of the country, by the South alone, or more specifically by Texas alone. That is a tribute to the distinguished services to the party and the responsible cooperation of LYNDON JOHNSON, the majority leader in the Senate, and Mr. SAM RAYBURN, the Speaker in the House. Those gentlemen, I am sure, would be the first to point out that there can be no effective leadership of a great national party without participation of all sections of the country. And all sections of the country are in fact represented in the



leadership of the Democratic Party in Congress. That leadership in the Senate, in addition to LYNDON JOHNSON of Texas, is composed of CARL HAYDEN of Arizona, our distinguished President pro tempore, the Secretary of the Democratic Conference, the very able TOM HENNING of Missouri, and myself as party whip. In the House of Representatives, the party is guided not only by Mr. RAYBURN but by the outstanding majority leader, JOHN MCCORMACK of Massachusetts, and CARL ALBERT, the very capable whip from Oklahoma.

Is there any merit at all in nonpartisan support of foreign policy? In the proper sense, I think there is. The most obvious advantage, of course, is that it presents to the outside world a united front on vital issues, to obtain the maximum effect where desired.

With the kind of problems we now face, however, it has become increasingly evident that unity on a national, nonpartisan basis is not enough. The point has been reached where something akin to an international nonpartisanship must be developed. By this I mean that more effective relationship must be achieved between ourselves and friendly democracies, so that we may avoid a repetition of the appalling sequence we have witnessed in the Suez area. There are more rewarding pastimes than to continue our incredible unpopularity contest with the Soviets in France and England.

Policies of the Western democracies during the past few years and particularly with respect to the Middle East question have given the appearance of a kind of diplomatic Tower of Babel. It is time for all to try to act with something approaching a singleness of purpose, even if we cannot speak with one tongue, if we are to avoid further disaster. In this respect, the Communist orbit has one important advantage. It knows where it is going. That has repeatedly been made clear to us, just as Hitler's purposes were made clear in *Mein Kampf*. In contrast, the United States and its Western allies have had little common perception of where we are going, and still less of an agreed idea on how to get there. If we had, some of the recent defeats might have been avoided. What is even worse, too many of us do not seem to be aware that we have suffered these defeats at all. It is in this, I believe, that the real danger lies.

If we compare the relative position of the United States—and the West—with the Soviet Union, we will have to concede that the Western position has deteriorated. Anyone who doubts this need only review on the map the gains made by the Soviets, at the expense of the West. The most recent of these, after two centuries of effort, was in the Middle East. The Communists are in there with both feet, without the use of military force, and despite the so-called northern tier defense system. If reports concerning the Syrian arms buildup are correct, the Kremlin may well have succeeded in turning the flank of the Baghdad nations without firing a shot. This paramount factor is going to influence and direct our policy action in that area for the foreseeable future.

What is most tragic about this crisis is that it did not descend upon us suddenly. There was every reason to anticipate it; and there was a great deal we might have done to prevent it. It had been germinating for several years, ever since the Israeli-Egyptian armistice agreement of 1949.

For the United States, it is a sorry illustration of the failure of a policy—or rather a lack of policy—since our aberrations in this area hardly qualify as a policy. There has been temporizing. Politics, domestic and international, have been played. We have done everything, so it seems to me, except face up to the problem and take the minimal steps necessary to keep peace in the Middle East.

It is all very well to say, as has been said by the administration, that we seek our answer to the difficult problems of the Middle East through the United Nations. And it is all very well to find, as a distinguished, able and outstanding Republican Senator, a man of great integrity, did find in discussions before this group, that the United Nations has fundamental weaknesses. I think we can agree—I know that I do—with both the administration and Senator KNOWLAND. The administration, as it says, has certainly placed a large part of our trust in the United Nations to solve the Middle East dilemma. And the United Nations, in dealing with this and other problems, as Senator KNOWLAND says, has displayed basic inadequacies.

Both the administration and Senator KNOWLAND, in my opinion, are correct but where does that leave us? If we are going to find the answer to this question, I believe we have to start by accepting the premise of the President and the very able and hard-working Secretary of State that peace, stability, and the preservation of the independence of the nations of the Middle East is in our vital national interests. We ought then ask ourselves whether we were correct in entrusting such a large measure of the defense of our vital interests in the Middle East to the United Nations which as Senator KNOWLAND correctly says, has basic structural weaknesses?

Where, then, do we go from there? It seems to me that we must either reassume part of the defense of those interests ourselves or seek to correct some of the basic structural weaknesses in the United Nations. I regret to say that I have seen no evidence of an eagerness on the part of the executive branch of the Government to do one or the other.

On the contrary, that branch seems willing to content itself on the one hand with sending to Congress an urgent resolution which on its own admission is directed at no immediate danger or difficulty in the Middle East. On the other hand, it continues to rely solely on the United Nations in dealing with the immediate and difficult problems of that area.

That seems to me to be a formula for inertia, for drift, for delay and ultimately for disaster. It is a policy which would make the United Nations the scapegoat for our irresponsibility. A scapegoat may relieve the executive branch of a sense of frustration in this situation, but it will hardly serve the interest of the United States. Either the Middle East is or is not vital to these interests. If it is, as the President says it is, then we had better defend those interests through the United Nations or otherwise.

The tendency to impose tasks on the United Nations beyond its capacities, then to bemoan the inadequacies of that organization but to take no initiative in their correction can ultimately bring us to only one end. This tendency, if persisted in, will eventually destroy even the limited capacity which the United Nations now possesses for constructive action. Before we are much further along this road, I think we had better stop for a moment to consider the consequences. I think we had better decide whether it is in the interests of the United States—our long-range interests—to continue in that direction.

My own view is that it is a highly dangerous direction. It is not, as some may think, the road of return to a secure national isolation. Scientific developments of the past two decades have closed off all roads back in that direction. Rather, it is the road to isolated internationalism; it is the road to the disastrous delusion of omnipotent national power.

The position I have assumed with regard to the President's proposal on the Middle

East is related very directly to this matter. I have been critical of this proposal. While I accepted the premise on which it is based, namely, that developments in the Middle East involve the vital interests of the United States, I do not accept fully the manner in which the President has proposed to protect them.

It has seemed to me that two basic steps are essential if these interests are to be protected. First, we must be prepared to reassume that portion of the responsibility which we have shifted to the United Nations which is beyond its present capacity; and, I may add parenthetically, that within our Government we must apportion the reassumed responsibility as between the executive branch and Congress more strictly in accord with the Constitution so as to avoid a misuse of power. Second, we must be prepared to enlarge the capacity of the United Nations to discharge responsibilities in the Middle East and elsewhere if the enlargement can be brought about. To that end I have proposed an amendment to the President's resolution which would make clear our support of the United Nations Emergency Force in the Middle East as a force for peace in that area. I have also proposed an amendment which would make clear our initiative in seeking international control of the present unrestricted arms traffic in the Middle East, one of the principal causes of the tension in that region.

The Western Nations face a serious predicament in the Middle East and we are not entirely without responsibility for it. Today Suez is in hostile hands—that is, hands hostile to the West. French strength is dispersed in Algeria, bogged down in a revolt. The British are gone from the canal area—with our encouragement—without retaining adequate guarantees for freedom of maritime transit. The supply of Europe's vital fuel is thus delivered over to the caprice of one Middle Eastern nation, which has yet to display a sense of its international responsibility. With the current drain on world shipping resulting from this situation, where would we be if another Korea broke out somewhere in the world? Is there not something incongruous in a policy which produces this kind of a result, a policy which alienates our friends and invites the Soviets to give aid to the Arab nations?

No American can take satisfaction over this unhappy record. Recriminations over how we got to the present point would be futile. On the other hand, an examination of the steps which, under Democratic and Republican administrations, led to the disaster, could contribute to the formulation of future policy. What is essential is that we should recognize what has happened for what it really is—a serious setback for the West. And we must begin without delay to repair the damage.

With respect to the Arab World, further penetration by the Soviet Union is not only possible but inevitable unless we bring our energies to a solution of the issues which have plagued the Middle East since 1948; unless we base our actions upon principle and not upon expediency; and unless we can persuade all the nations in the Middle East that we have no desire to replace Britain and France in the vacuum we helped to create.

It must, instead, be made clear to them, by every means at our command, that our objective is the preservation of their independence—and not necessarily only their independence of Russian communism. That is the menace today. Tomorrow the menace may arise elsewhere.

With respect to Western Europe, it is imperative to restore the former confidence which has been shattered and to rebuild the foundations of mutual understanding. This applies to all relations with our allies, including their problems with dependent territories. It is well and good to support

bona fide nationalist movements and the natural desire of peoples to be independent. Let us take care, however, to avoid paths which conflict with our vital interests.

Of the many lines of action we might follow there is one that should be pursued immediately. I believe we should do what we can to enable Europe to reassert its former influence in the councils of the world. We can do this by encouraging the nations of Europe to draw together in closer association, as is the case in the coal-steel community. Separately, each of these nations has lost much of its former authority in

international affairs. Drawn together in a common enterprise, the collectivity of Europe can once again exert the power which is commensurate with its magnificent heritage and the great capacities of its inhabitants.

We should also give very serious thought to encouraging a pooling of the economic and technological resources of Western Europe and the development of close ties ourselves with that pool. It is almost ludicrous that the Western nations should be withholding their markets and technical processes from each other, while bidding against themselves for the Kremlin's trade.

Such is exactly what the Communists want. Europe's leaders may be coming to see this. They are, at the moment, concluding negotiations to establish a common market through the elimination of trade barriers and the creation of Euratom. I consider these important first steps which the United States should support; but they are only the first steps to that cooperation which must exist among the nations of Europe and with the United States. We can only achieve it, if we proceed with an urgency of purpose, recognizing that, in truth, we are met upon a major battleground.

## SENATE

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 1957

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, our Father, Thou art the reality behind all shadows, the shining presence at the altar of our heart's devotion. Closing the doors of a noisy world, so full of terror and alarms, we pause at this shrine of quietness and peace to acknowledge Thy sovereignty. Thou hast made us for Thy holy purposes. May the mire and misery of our moral failures prove but steppingstones to our better selves. Purge our minds of the prejudices which separate us from others. Cleanse our hearts of the uncleanness which blinds our eyes. Make us builders of the road of world concord, which shall make the rough places smooth and the deep ruts level, and of bridges of understanding which shall at last span the chasms which separate Thy warring children, and over which the glad and eager feet of brothers shall pass to and fro in a world of peace. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, February 26, 1957, was approved, and its reading was dispensed with.

### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Tribbe, one of his secretaries.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 5189) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

### HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 5189) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other

purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

### ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO TOMORROW AT 11 A. M.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in adjournment until tomorrow, at 11 o'clock a. m.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### VISIT TO THE SENATE BY GIRLS DRILL TEAM FROM HOUSTON, TEX.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, before I came to Washington, to join the Federal service, I taught school in Houston, Tex. This morning I have had the very unusual privilege of welcoming to Washington a large group of high-class students from one of the best high schools in the largest city in Texas. It is not the high school in which I taught; nevertheless, it is one of the outstanding educational institutions of the Southwest. These students—63 charming, intelligent, and very pretty girls, members of the girls drill team of Reagan High School—are today in the gallery, with their sponsors. It is with pleasure and gratification that I present to the Senate this fine group of young Texan and American womanhood. I should like to ask that they stand, and that the Senate welcome them.

(The group of students rose in their places in the gallery, and were greeted with applause.)

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article giving the history of this fine organization and the names of those in attendance today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The article and the names appear in the RECORD.)

### TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour for the transaction of routine business. I ask unanimous consent that statements made in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

#### AREA ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1957

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to assist areas to develop and maintain stable and diversified economies by a program of financial and technical assistance and otherwise, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

#### DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents in the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. CARLSON members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

### PETITION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

#### House Concurrent Resolution 520

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to amend title I of the United States Social Security Act to authorize the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to approve a State plan which provides, in determining need, an exemption of \$50 per month earned income in the old-age assistance category as is now provided in title 10 of such Social Security Act granting this exemption, in determining need, to recipients of the aid to the blind category

Whereas the aged and indigent citizens of the State of Oklahoma and the United States blazed the way in the frontiers of America for the development of the United States of America, the benefits of which the present generation are now reaping; and

Whereas the courage and fortitude of these people laid the foundation upon which the State of Oklahoma and the United States have developed; and

Whereas they did throughout their period of struggle and did throughout their lifetime, insofar as they were able, support and maintain the government of the State of Oklahoma and the United States for the benefit of the present generation; and